



BX 5145 .A3 G3 1891

Gasquet, Francis Aidan, 1846-
-1929.

Edward VI and the Book of
Common Prayer



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

EDWARD VI
AND THE
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Horarium Canonici series

Domine prime Adventus dñi

Ad Matutinas

Ante omnes horas tam diurnas quam nocturnas
per totum anni cursum dicitur. Oro dñica
qua dicta continuo incipit sacerdos. Dñe labia
et. Deus in adiutorium et. Gloria pri et
cum Haleluja. Hic mos toto anno observandus
est excepto qd a septuagesima usq; ad
Pascha in loco Aleluja dicitur. Laus
tibi domine Rex eterne glorie. Imitatorium
Christum dñm per prophetas promissum
venite adoremus Psalmus. Venite
confortemur et cum Gloria pri et. Hymn
Verbum superius et Psalmi ex ordine
designati. Affirmantur autem psalmi omnes
et cantata per totum. Quid cum Gloria pri et
Antiphona. Nos precessit dñs autem
appropinquavit, abijtiamus ergo opera
tenebrarum et induamur arma Lucis.
Lectio tribus ex calendario designato
petende sunt. ~~Quarta lectio per Danielem~~
~~et. Septuaginta hebdomadarum abbe~~
~~ante sunt usq; ad profuerunt et solatio~~
Benedictio ad prima Lectio reddenda. ~~Benedictio~~
Benedictione perpetua benedicat nos pater
eternus. Ad. 2. Deus dei filius nos bene
dicere et adiuuare dignetur. Ad. 3. et
Spiritus sancti Gra illuminet corda
sensu et corda mea. Ad. 4. In caritate
perfecta confirmet nos Trinitas sancta
Porro unaquęq; lectio sua ad Matutinas
sua ad vespertinas horas in sube dñe
benedicere. Sacerdote benedictionem
subiungente incipit atq; terminabit
cum Tu autem domine miserere nostri

Imitatorium no. 20.
petatur amplius
ante fine psalmi
et psalmi altor
nati dicatur

Benedictio
per 20. la. pona
ante lectorem



EDWARD VI

AND THE

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

*AN EXAMINATION INTO ITS ORIGIN AND EARLY
HISTORY WITH AN APPENDIX OF
UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS.*

BY

✓
FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET D.D. O.S.B.,
AUTHOR OF "HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES"

AND EDMUND BISHOP.

~~~~~  
*Third Edition.*  
~~~~~

JOHN HODGES,
AGAR STREET, CHARING CROSS, LONDON.
1891.

PRINTED AT NIMEGUEN (HOLLAND) BY H. C. A. THIEME OF NIMEGUEN (HOLLAND)

AND

14 BILLITER SQUARE BUILDINGS, LONDON E. C.

C O N T E N T S.

	PAGE.
TO THE READER.	VII
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.	IX
Chapter I. CHURCH SERVICES AT THE DEATH OF	
HENRY VIII	1— 16
II. CRANMER'S PROJECTED BREVIARY	17— 29
III. CRANMER'S SECOND PROJECT	30— 39
IV. PREPARATION FOR CHANGE	40— 62
V. THE PARLIAMENT AND CONVOCATION 1547.	63— 81
VI. THE COMMUNION BOOK	82— 96
VII. PROCLAMATIONS AND PREACHINGS	97—117
VIII. THE PRESS ON THE MASS	118—133
IX. THE NEW LITURGY: TIME, PLACE, PERSONS ETC.	134—147
X. CONVOCATION AND THE PRAYER BOOK . .	148—156
XI. THE DEBATE ON THE SACRAMENT IN PARLIA- MENT 1548.	157—181
XII. THE FIRST ENGLISH BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER	182—215
XIII. THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1549 AND CONTEM- PORARY LITURGIES	216—235
XIV. THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW SERVICE . .	236—258
XV. FURTHER PROJECTS	259—276
XVI. THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK 1552	277—307

A P P E N D I X.

	PAGE.
I. ACCOUNT OF MS. REG. 7 B. IV	311—314
II. CRANMER'S BREVIARY SCHEME	315—352
III. CRANMER'S SCHEME FOR MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER	353—382
IV. THE LECTIONARIES AND CALENDARS	383—394
V. THE DEBATE ON THE SACRAMENT IN PARLIAMENT 1548.	395—443
VI. THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION	444—448
VII. NOTE ON THE ACTS OF CONVOCATION 1547	449—451

TO THE READER.

The present work had its origin in the desire to edit Cranmer's hitherto unnoticed projects of liturgical reform printed in the appendix. In the researches necessary for this purpose, it was found that the history of the religious changes under Edward VI had in some points become involved in much and seemingly unnecessary obscurity. It therefore appeared desirable to present the story of the origin of the Book of Common Prayer as a whole. Other documents were found which had escaped the attention of previous writers and amongst these the notes of the discussion in Parliament preceding the introduction of the first Act of Uniformity. This document affords new details in the history of the Prayer Book, and gives the only reliable information about the views entertained by the english bishops on the subject. Apart from this, the "Notes" are of considerable interest as being the earliest report of a debate in Parliament.

Though treating of liturgy the object of the work is strictly historical. Unless a clear and intelligible idea can be gained of the liturgical changes in the reign of Edward VI. it is impossible to understand a period which is the turning point in the religious history of England.

The authors desire to record their thanks to the authorities of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, for permission to use the manuscripts in their library. To the Rev. S. S. Lewis M. A. the librarian, in particular, they are indebted for his special kindness to them.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The first edition of this book was issued with only a few words of introduction. In putting forth a second some further prefatory remarks seem to be called for.

Regret has been expressed in more than one quarter that the entire manuscript containing Cranmer's projects for liturgical reform had not been printed. The reason is simple; the appendix contains everything of real historical interest. What remains still unprinted may afford some scope for minute antiquarian investigation or some subject for speculation. The *lessons* of the second scheme in particular might invite remark: for instance the already advanced character of the proposed english liturgical reform may be further illustrated by the disuse of the Vulgate. Cranmer's erasure of St. Babilas from the calendar is doubtless explained by the story of this martyr, the proposed lesson, derived from St. Chrysostom's longer homily on the subject, scarcely according with the Tudor idea of the due relation between regality and the priesthood. The lesson for St. Gordias, although referred in the manuscript to St. Basil, shows that Cranmer did not disdain the help of a then recent hagiologist. But the result of such detailed enquiries, whatever it be, will have no effect whatever in varying, though it might here or

there deepen, the historical lines already sufficiently clear.

As regards the *hymns*, to the omission of which in the appendix special attention has been called, it seemed unnecessary to print them in full. For the most part they are well known, and are to be found in the breviaries in daily use. The only point of real interest, namely, that Cranmer, as appears from minute variants, took his text from the volume of Clichtoveus and not from the old breviaries, has been already indicated.

In these circumstances it still seems best to leave the appendix as it stood in the first edition. Liturgically, Cranmer's still-born projects are of no value; and it is believed that their historical interest has been practically exhausted.

The notices which this book has received have suggested a few observations on one or two points of detail.

I. *Convocation.*

Special interest has been manifested in the question as to the approval of the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 by Convocation. The object of the examination of this question in these pages was to elucidate an obscure and doubtful point of history and to enable the reader, so far as was possible, to come to a probable conclusion. In estimating the probabilities due weight hardly seems to have been given to the evidence against such approval drawn from the discussion on the Sacrament in Parliament¹. It is true that the *argumentum e silentio* is continually abused, but it does not follow that it has not its

¹ See p. 181 (5).

due and proper use. In the present case it seems almost impossible to believe that had Convocation actually and formally approved the Prayer Book, Somerset, placed in the position into which Thirlby had forced him, could have maintained silence as to such approval. The authors must own that to them this argument seemed finally conclusive and it consequently appeared unnecessary to burden their pages with further discussions.

To those, however, who are particularly interested in the subject, it is proper to point out that the treatment of Convocation by the governing powers in the reign of Edward VI. forms a consistent whole and has a history of its own. In dealing with any special part of that history the whole must be borne in mind.

The matter is well illustrated by what took place in 1552. The relation of Convocation to the catechism and articles set forth under its name in 1553 is obscure, but a comparison of the scanty records which remain make the following results almost certain:

(1) The articles and catechism were submitted to the bishops ¹.

(2) They were never submitted to the lower house of Convocation.

(3) But "sundry others of our clergy", a small select body, all or many of them members of Convocation, had a hand in the matter.

(4) As a result they were printed by the king's authority as the work of Convocation "agreed upon by the bishops and other learned and godly men, in the last Convocation at London in the year of our Lord 1552".

¹ Burnet's "brought into the upper house" is more precise than the evidence warrants.

(5) When the matter was objected to Cranmer in his disputation at Oxford in 1554, he replied "I was ignorant of the setting to of that title and as soon as I had knowledge thereof I did not like it. Therefore when I complained thereof to the Council it was answered me by them that the book was so entitled because it was set forth in the time of the Convocation" ¹.

The various steps taken in regard to the articles and catechism thus bear a close resemblance to the course followed in regard to the Prayer Book in 1548. The answer of the Council to the archbishop's objection to the catechism and articles being issued as if with the approval of Convocation is perhaps sufficient evidence of the justice and moderation of the remark, that to examine closely into the terms of official documents is "a process not unnecessary in a period marked by so many doubtful dealings on the part of the rulers".

In fact it is clear that the abolition of Convocation was one of the items of general policy determined upon in the early days of this reign, and that in practice the aim of the rulers was to discredit its authority, impair its influence and supersede it generally by informal committees wholly dependent on themselves. All this was only a preparation for its final destruction provided for in the archbishop's *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* ².

¹ See Burnet III. 1. 210—213. The original passages relating to the subject are: Foxe VI. 468; Ridley's *Works*, Parker Soc. 216—7; Philpot's *Works*, Parker Soc. p. 179—181 (cf. p. XIII) See also Burnet, III. 2. 205—6. Brooke's sermon contains nothing more on the subject than the few lines extracted by Burnet.

² This explains the profound resentment which animated members of Convocation against Cranmer on the accession of Mary.

II. *The Mozarabic Missal.*

It seems unnecessary either to enlarge or to modify what has been already said on the subject (pp. 185—6, 206—7 and 444—8). It would be easy but hardly profitable to discuss more minutely the subsidiary questions that have been raised.

The bearing of the possible intercourse between Spain and England consequent on the marriage of Katherine was obvious and had not escaped attention, but the difficulty was to discover satisfactory evidence of literary intercourse in Henry's reign ¹.

Even on the supposition that Cranmer possessed, or had access to, a copy of this liturgy, the only conclusion that can be drawn is, that in a volume of nearly 1900 folio columns of print, a *missal*, he found as proper for his purpose in the compilation of his new Prayer Book only one column—it may be a line or two more or less—and that not relating to the *mass*, but to the blessing of the font.

III. *The Isidorean Theory.*

To the influence of the spanish rites on the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer as much space has been allotted in this book as the matter in its historical bearings could warrant. Indeed the whole subject would seem to have assumed a fictitious importance. Still, as it has been touched upon again, it is perhaps useful to deal with a

¹ For instance in the king's library in 1542 only three spanish books appear. As they are interesting in themselves it may be as well to mention them: "Dantis works in the castilian tongue"— "Triumphes of Petrarch in castilian"— "Salustius with songis in Spanyssh" (R. O. Augt. Off. Misc. Bk. 160 ff. 109a, 114b, 119a).

kindred theory, which the authors had previously examined, but which, on a review of the whole circumstances appeared to them devoid of any foundation in fact.

This theory is the influence supposed to have been exercised by St. Isidore of Seville on the revision of the Anglican Prayer Book in 1552. The impression on this subject is most conveniently expressed in a document which from its character has naturally obtained the widest circulation.

"In A. D. 1534" runs the passage "was printed at Leipsic and Antwerp, edited by Joannes Cochleus, the treatise and revision by Isidore of Seville of that form of Gallican liturgy called the Mozarabic, as used in the 6th and 7th centuries and long before (Isid. Hispal. De off. Eccl., Lips. 4to., Antv. Svo., 1534). This work was dedicated to Dr. Robert Ridley, uncle of Bishop Ridley. In the dedication Cranmer himself is named as 'vir eruditus et theologus insignis.' It naturally excited much attention; it is quoted by several of the chief Reformers. Scholars are now investigating the large use of it made in other parts of the books of both 1549 and 1552. It was the more notable because Cardinal Ximenes had in 1500 refounded the use in Spain in such amplified form as was then possible, which is not so sure to have come under Cranmer's notice. Both forms give evidence which is to the point. A mixed cup was used, but in the ancient form there is no order and no prayer for mixing. In the later, the rubric and prayers are included in the *preparatio* which had in the interval grown up before the Introit and Ante-Communion (Burbidge 196, 202, etc.)"¹

¹ *In the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Read and*

In the foregoing passage the two "forms" mentioned are :

(1) the Mozarabic missal : and

(2) St. Isidore's tract entitled *de officiis ecclesiasticis*.

The theory to be examined is based on this latter and has nothing to do with the Mozarabic missal which has been dealt with.

The character of this tract must be first clearly understood. It is not a liturgy in any sense, but an exposition and often a mystical interpretation of ecclesiastical life and practice. In order that the reader may be put in full possession of the reasons adduced for believing that St. Isidore was a guide to the reformers in the revision of the english liturgy of 1552, the entire chapter of the work in question is here translated and Mr. Burbidge's arguments are given in the margin.

ST. ISIDORE.

REMARKS.

Book I. chapter 15. *Of the mass and Prayers.*

But the order of the mass and prayers by which the sacrifices offered to God are consecrated was first instituted by St. Peter; the celebration of which the whole world observes (*peragit*) in one and the same way.

The first of these is a prayer of admonition toward the people that

This " may be compared with the english exhortation 'dearly beloved

others v. the Lord Bishop of Lincoln. Judgment. Nov. 21, 1890 (London, 1890).

they may be stirred up to entreat God.

in the Lord'; and the words *fratres charissimi* are in it in almost every service". (*Liturgies and offices of the Church*. By Edward Burbidge, M.A. p. 198. Note 1).

The second is of invocation to God that he would graciously receive the prayers of the faithful and their oblation.

The third is poured forth for those who are offering or for the faithful departed that they may obtain pardon through the same sacrifice.

"The second and third prayers take the place of our prayer for the Church militant. Special notice should be paid to the fact that the prayer for the Church was thus separated from the consecration prayer" *ibid.* note 2).

After these the fourth is introduced that all reconciled to each other in charity may be united together as worthy of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. For the indivisible body of Christ does not permit individual discord.

"The fourth prayer may be compared in respect of its position and intention with our invitation, confession, absolution, and comfortable words" (*ibid.* note 3).

The fifth is brought in as an introduction to the sanctification of the oblation, in which also all

"The fifth prayer corresponds with our preface,

earthly creatures and heavenly powers are summoned to the praising of God; and *Hosanna in excelsis* is sung, because, by the birth of Our Saviour from the race of David, salvation has come to the world, even to the highest.

Sanctus and prayer of consecration" *ibid.* note 4).

Moreover the sixth now follows, the confirmation of the Sacrament, in order that the oblation of the body and blood which is offered to God, being sanctified by the Holy spirit, may be confirmed.

"The sixth prayer may be compared in respect to the contents of many examples of it ¹ with our prayer of humble access" (p 199 note 1) ².

The last of these prayers is that which Our Lord taught his disciples to pray, saying: Our Father who art in heaven.

[Here follows in the tract a short exposition of the Lord's prayer which

¹ These be it remarked can only be known in the Mozarabic missal itself and not by the tract of St. Isidore.

² At p. 201 the author calls attention to the difference between St. Isidore and the Anglican communion service; namely that this sixth prayer is omitted.

need not be translated as having no bearing on the present discussion. It ends:] Our Saviour therefore taught this prayer, in which is contained the hope of the faithful and the confession of sins, whereof the prophet foretelling says, *Et erit etc.*

These then are the seven prayers of the sacrifice commended by apostolic and evangelical doctrine. The reason of instituting the particular number seems to be either because of the sevenfold universality of the holy Church, or on account of the sevenfold graces of the Spirit, by whose gift those things which are offered are sanctified."

The foregoing presents to the reader the suggested guide of archbishop Cranmer in his reform of the Anglican liturgy of 1552 and the arguments by which that theory is supported. These invite some comment. It will be observed that it is entirely founded on a question of *order*, not upon a comparison of formularies. The similarity even of order breaks down at the very beginning. St. Isidore places first a prayer of admonition toward the people and secondly a prayer of invocation that God may receive

the prayers of the faithful. The Communion service of 1552 reverses this order.

In the next place the question is not whether the prayers mentioned by St. Isidore "may be compared with," or "correspond with", or "take the place of," certain portions of the Anglican communion service; but whether the revisers of 1552 took the order of prayers given in this tract of St. Isidore as their pattern.

It may however be further asked, whether the general character of the tract is such as to recommend it to the particular and favourable consideration of Cranmer. Ample materials exist for forming a correct judgment as to his opinions at this period year after year. Moreover the whole tenour of his ecclesiastical acts are well-known. The question therefore is, how would the doctrine and tone of St. Isidore's work accord with the temper and bent of Cranmer's mind at this period. The first chapter deals with the component parts of the divine office, with its hymns and antiphons and reponsories, which Cranmer had just set aside. It treats of the canonical hours, matins and lauds, tierce, sext, none, vespers and compline, which Cranmer considered the church had now outgrown. St. Isidore also deals with those lesser orders of subdeacon, lector etc., all which were now abolished in the church of England.

Turning to details the tract is found to be replete with doctrine condemned by Cranmer in no measured terms. The offertories, for example which, as St. Isidore says, under the old law were chaunted when the victims were immolated, we joyfully sing "in that true sacrifice by the blood of which the world has been saved". In his chapter on the sacrifice he begins: "The sacrifice that is offered by christians to God our Lord and Master, Christ instituted when

He gave to His apostles His body and blood before He was betrayed".

Again. "We believe that it is a tradition from the very apostles themselves to offer sacrifice for the repose of the faithful departed and to pray for them, because this is observed throughout the whole world". Further, St. Isidore mentions the fires of purgatory, and he distinguishes clearly between the sacrifice of the altar and the sacrifice of our prayers, referring this latter to offices such as vespers.

There can be no doubt therefore that the whole of St. Isidore's work runs directly counter to the line of ecclesiastical policy which Cranmer and his friends were forcing on the nation during Edward's reign; and that he could not have looked to it as a guide in the revision of the Communion Service of 1552. The key to this the authors believe is to be found in Cranmer's own works.

The study of liturgy can be pursued usefully and fruitfully only on those rational methods which should govern all historical investigation. In the case of a document like the Book of Common Prayer it is a dictate of common-sense that any examination of its origin and sources should be conducted with a primary regard to the circumstances in which, and the opinions of the persons by whom, it was produced. In a word it must be put in its proper historical setting and illustrated from the writings of those who composed it, or their friends, and not by the productions of those centuries the doctrine and practice of which it was the avowed aim and intention of its authors to destroy.

CHAPTER I.

CHURCH SERVICE AT THE CLOSE OF HENRY'S REIGN.

The first Convocation of clergy in the reign of Edward VI. met at St. Paul's on November 5, 1547. The lower house immediately upon their assembling "agreed that the prolocutor in the name of the whole house should report to the most Reverend" the archbishop of Canterbury certain petitions, among which was the following: "that the labours of the bishops and others, who by command of Convocation had been engaged in examining, reforming and setting forth (*et edendo*) the divine service should be produced and should be submitted to the examination of this house".

Archbishop Cranmer's notes of this meeting show some important variations from the official record on this matter. According to his version, the clergy declared that "by command of king Henry VIII." certain prelates and learned men were "appointed... to devise a uniform order; who according to the same appointment did make certain books, as they be informed". And the object of their request was, according to Cranmer's statement, that these books should be submitted to them "for a better expedition of divine service to be set forth accordingly"¹.

¹ This statement may perhaps in part have been drawn from, or suggested by, the address of the Prolocutor; the con-

What the result of this application may have been does not appear; nor does mention of these books occur in any other record. It has been tacitly assumed that if they did indeed exist, they have disappeared. Convocation however, was in fact accurately informed when it spoke of their existence: and for the last three hundred years in all probability such a book has lain among the manuscripts of the Royal library. The identification of the volume removes one of the difficulties which has hitherto stood in the way of any satisfactory investigation into the origin and character of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.

Up to the present time there has been an entire want of material to illustrate the history and course of the composition of this book, and of the steps whereby it assumed its present form. There has been nothing but the book complete as it stands in print. The spirit which dictated and directed the compilation has been a matter of conjecture, coloured not infrequently, as is natural in such a case, by the personal prepossessions of the writer. This is the more unfortunate, since a just estimate of the character of a document of such supreme importance is a first and necessary condition for a right understanding of the history of the religious changes in England during the sixteenth century.

The first Prayer Book of Edward VI. was in itself a revolution; and that on two grounds. Local and diocesan usage of every sort was swept away and an absolute uniformity was prescribed for the whole realm, — a thing unheard of in the ancient Catholic church in England no less than in France and Ger-

flict of statement as to the king's commandment and the command of Convocation certainly cannot be thus explained.

many. This note of uniformity is struck emphatically in the Act itself, which also declares the peace and quiet to be engendered by the change. Secondly, a book was introduced, the form and disposition of which was unlike any hitherto in use for public worship in England.

Whether a nearer examination would show that the divergence is rather one of outward seeming than of reality is a matter involving many considerations. Amongst these must necessarily find a place the following: what position does the first Prayer Book hold in regard to the ancient service books in England, or other contemporary documents of the same kind? Is it conservative? Is it innovating? And how far is it either? What was its inspiration? What were its sources? Unfortunately all these questions have become involved in extraneous and notably polemical considerations. These, as all will allow, are hardly favourable to the investigation or exposition of bare historic truth. But, in spite of these, it should not be impossible to fix, with a sufficient degree of accuracy and certainty, the position which the Prayer Books of Edward VI. really hold in the religious history of the time; especially when new documents can be produced to make the task more easy or the result more sure.

No attempt will be made to enquire whether the change brought about was good or whether it was bad. The present investigation is concerned with facts, and where doctrinal questions must be touched upon to elucidate the mere course of events or change of individual opinion, the actors will be allowed to give their own statements of their own beliefs. Thus the enquiry whether this revolution, which swept away the old order and established in its place the liturgy now holding the affection

of the majority of Englishmen, was providential, or whether it was a revolt against established law, is altogether foreign to the present purpose.

As a prelude it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the condition of public worship at the end of the reign of Henry VIII. Looking back across the course which events actually took in the establishment of an exclusively vernacular service in England, there has been a tendency to attribute an undue importance to the Primers or other prayer books in English issued in the later years of that reign. Vernacular prayers for private use were common in the middle ages, and the contents of the primers, which were essentially designed for such private devotion, fall almost entirely outside the ground covered by the first public english service book.

Glancing at the state of affairs at the moment of Henry's death it may be said that the system of public worship, which existed throughout the middle ages in England, remained intact and in full force. The rites of Sarum, York and Hereford were in practical use as they had been an hundred years before, the same books, the same ceremonies¹.

The acts of Convocation in 1542 however show already a disposition to limit this diversity by prescribing the observance of the Sarum rite for the whole province of Canterbury. There appears however no evidence to show that the use of Hereford was then abrogated. It is not impossible that this order was caused by the sudden secularization of so large a body of clergy who had, as members of regular orders,

¹ The purgation to which the service books had been subjected was confined to the omission of the word "Pope", to the suppression of the office and name of St. Thomas of Canterbury and to a correction of typographical errors.

been accustomed to their own special rites and who, in the change of condition, must have been at a loss to tell what breviary to adopt in order to satisfy an obligation binding them in conscience to the daily recitation of the divine office.

It has been suggested by some recent writers of repute that the suppression of the monastic houses necessitated a change in the method of public worship in order to render the daily homage of the creature compatible with secular duties. It is moreover implied that all offices, except a morning and evening prayer, were designed only for regular religious. These ideas seem due to a misapprehension. The disappearance of the monasteries in no way affected the worship in cathedral or parish churches. It is true that on the refoundation of the monastic cathedrals a body of clergy was instituted somewhat less numerous than it had been on the old footing, if for no other reason at least for this, that a given revenue would suffice for a larger number of men living in community than of men each in receipt of a separate income and keeping up a separate household. But even the cathedrals of the new foundation had a body of clergy fully able to maintain the divine office in becoming splendour ¹.

Except in so far as personal obligations were concerned, a cathedral or collegiate church of secular clergy was bound to a perpetual round of praise and service hardly less onerous than that of the most observant monastery. The obligation however lay upon them as members of their church and not, as they would strenuously have contended, by vow as

¹ The clergy who remained in the old monastic cathedrals upon the suppression of the monastery were not uncommonly recommended by the royal agents as "good choir men."

religious. The public recitation of the canonical hours great and small, it is true, originated with persons inclined to what is technically called the religious life: *monazantes*, as they are named in the recently discovered *Peregrinateo Silviae*, which throws considerable light upon this as well as upon so many other ecclesiastical usages at the close of the fourth century ¹.

Still, as early as the time of St. Gregory the Great, it was assumed that the office in a cathedral or even a considerable church was to be publicly sung. By the eighth century the clergy of such churches were regarded and regarded themselves as a real community, the provisions made for the conduct and observance of which differed but slightly from those of a community of monks. There was however this essential difference between them; though the canons around their bishop lived on common funds, they retained their rights to their own property and, subject of course to the obedience of all clergy to their bishop, were free to come and go.

In the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries the canons, especially of episcopal churches, gradually emancipated themselves from ancient restrictions. The funds originally common, became allotted to individual members of the body. This practice received recognition and confirmation more or less early from the bishops, when the episcopal mensa and that of the canons became distinct and separate.

The change produced in course of time a departure not less marked in the opposite direction. This latter

¹ See Duchesne, *Origines du culte Chrétien*, Paris, 1889. pp. 433—436, for an account of the way in which the public celebration of the divine office grew to be recognized as a duty of the ecclesiastical state.

tendency was to a renunciation of all private property and the assumption of religious vows, and thus by the beginning of the twelfth century the distinction of regular canons and secular canons was an accomplished fact. To the class of secular canons belonged all our non-monastic english cathedrals except Carlisle: and St. Osmund's title to the gratitude of his church will be probably found to lie, not in the liturgical reforms which legend has attributed to him, but in his legislation for the new pattern in his cathedral church at Sarum. Such canons throwing off perhaps gradually the old community restrictions came to differ in no wise, so far as their method of life was concerned, from the rest of the secular clergy. The others formed themselves into a religious order in the strictest sense of the word and became known as regular or Augustinian canons. The name "Canon" common to both, recalls the state of life from which both had sprung, but which both had abandoned. Henceforward whilst bearing this common name they are perfectly distinct in life and spirit. By a contradiction in terms one class came to be called secular canons, whilst the other by tautology received the name of regular canons¹.

In one point however churches of canons, whether secular or regular, kept to the old lines. Both were bound to and observed the solemn and public recitation of the entire divine office although now on

¹ Trithemius long ago drew attention to this "a secular canon" it is as much as to say "a white black" he writes. See in Ducange s.v. *canonicus*. This article of Ducange is unfortunately misleading on the origin of secular canons, although a careful perusal of the passages cited therein is sufficient to detect the mistake which is corrected later s.v. *Regulares*. The question is accurately exposed in Amort Disc: Vet: *Canonicorum*, pp. 329—333.

different grounds. The regular canons observed this duty as members of a religious order; the secular canons as incorporated into a church, whether cathedral or collegiate, by the foundation and tradition of which its members voluntarily undertook the obligation so long as they held their prebend¹.

To come to detail: taken as the rule the life of a canon in our english cathedrals up to the close of Henry's days was one of no slight labour and mortification. The church offices were long: they made up a day's work quite apart from all questions of time to be given to study, private devotion, or the ordinary claims of daily life. The choral work began early. Morwen, chaplain to bishop Bonner of London, in commenting on a sermon preached by Pilkington in June 1561, when lightning had struck the steeple of St. Paul's, and the roof and bells had been burnt, called attention to the change which had been made in the mode of worship. "Now," he says, "whether the people of this realm be declined from the steps of St. Augustine and other blessed fathers and saints which had mass and seven sacraments in the church, and God was honoured night and day in the church with divine service, I think there is no man so simple but he may easily perceive, except malice have blinded his heart. As in

¹ The universal tradition as to common life in cathedrals must be borne in mind in estimating the introduction of monks into english cathedral churches under king Edgar and later. Probably a practical compromise was come to, by allowing the clergy of the other english episcopal churches, where the common life had been abandoned, to go on as they were. This will explain William of Malmesbury's "*contra morem Anglorum*". In fact traces of the old common life survived more generally in France long after the cathedrals had been settled on the new model.

St. Paul's church in London, by the decrees of blessed fathers, every night at midnight they had matins; all the forenoon masses in the church with other divine service and continual prayer, and in the steeple anthems and prayers were had certain times".¹

Pilkington in his reply writes: — "further, where he charges us with declining from the steps of the blessed fathers which ordained in Paul's matins to be had at midnight, all forenoon masses, and in the steeple anthems; these things we do not only not deny, for we do not count such superstitious idolaters to be our fathers in religion, but we rejoice and praise God for our deliverance from such superstitions. They crack much of blessed fathers and yet name not who they be, but much it shall not skill but their deeds shall prove their holiness. What great holiness was this, to have matins at midnight when folk were on sleep in their beds! Is not common prayer to be had at such hours when the people might resort to it conveniently? If midnight be such a time most convenient let the world judge.... In Paul's and abbeys at their midnight prayers were none commonly but a few bawling priests, young quiristers and novices which understood not what they said. The elder sort kept their beds.... A prayer not understood in the heart but spoken with the lips is rather to be counted prating and bawling than praying with good devotion. The elder sort both in cathedral churches and abbeys almost never came at their midnight prayer. It was thought enough to knoll the bells and make men believe that they rose to prayer, therefore

¹ Printed in Pilkington's *Works* (ed Parker Soc:), p. 483.

they have not so much to crack of this their doing... But as all their religion is of their own devising so is their reward. God has made them no such promise and therefore they can claim nothing at his hands." ¹

Whether Pilkington was carried away by his fervour in confutation or not may be left an open question. But the popular appreciation of these services may be gauged by a letter which gives a glimpse of Catholic cathedral life in Mary's days. The writer was apparently one of the canons of Hereford. Its date is about 1583 or 1584; it is addressed to Scory the aged bishop of the see, and its object is to secure a stricter confinement for the catholic recusants who "are more increased this day in Hereford than ever were this twenty five years before."

"Right Honorable and Reverend Father" it begins, "my bounden duty always remembered; may it please your lordship to be advertised or to put in memory that in the dark days of queen Mary the dean then and the clergy of your cathedral church of Hereford did orderly observe their superstitious orders (*i. e.* services), and were present thereat continually, except certain days of licence which are called days of jubilee. ² And did preach their superstitious dregs not only, but also did in their outward living keep great hospitality. For every night at midnight they with the whole vicars choral

¹ Pilkington's *Works*, pp. 527—8.

² This was evidently a term current in Hereford for leaves of absence, but does not appear to have been in use in other english cathedrals, as far as a cursory examination of the available Statutes has shown.

would rise to matins and especially the 'domydary',¹ for the week being, would be the first.

"Then at five o'clock in the morning at St. Nicholas mass; then at other masses at certain altars; then at eight of the clock our Lady mass was solemnly said. Then at nine the prime and hours; then the high mass was in saying until it was eleven of the clock, besides every man must have said his own private mass at some one or other altar daily."

"Then after dinner to even song till five o'clock, in which time of service a number of tapers were burning every day, and there was great censuring at the high altar daily to their idols, and there was a lamp burning day and night continually before their gods. And every sabbath day and festival day St. Thomas' bell should ring to procession and the dean would send his somner² to warn the mayor to the procession. And then upon the somner's warning the mayor would send the sergeants to the parish churches, every man in his ward to the alderman. Then the alderman would cause the parish priest to command all the freemen to attend on the mayor to the procession³ or lecture. For want of a sermon there should be a lecture in the chapter house every sabbath and holy day, notwithstanding they were at high mass in the choir. And then by the mayor and commons it was agreed at a general law-day that if the mayor did not come to procession and sermon he should pay 12d. for every default and every alderman 8d. and every man of the election 6d. and every freeman or gild merchant 4d., if it were known they were

¹ *i. e.* Hebdomadarian, or weekly officiant, whether in secular or regular churches.

² *i. e.* his verger.

³ That is before the High Mass.

absent and within the hearing of the said bell and did not come, which ordinance was and is recorded in the custom book of the city: so zealous and diligent were the temporality then in observing those dregs of the clergy. Then the dean and clergy would come so orderly to church with such a godly show of humbleness and in keeping such hospitality that it did allure the people to what order they would request them."

"This is true for I did see and know it; but then did I as a child and knew not the truth, and then such heavy burdens were but light; but now in these joyful days of light how heavy is it among a number of us to come two hours of the day to serve the true God, the everlasting King of all glory. It is lamentable to think on it and much more grievous to him that did see the blind zeal in darkness so observed, and now the true light and pathway to salvation neglected. Then were there tapers, torches and lamps great plenty, with censuring to idols most costly in the clearest day of summer; and now not scarce one little candle is allowed or maintained to read a chapter in the dark evenings in the choir. And as for resorting to hear the truth of the gospel, it is little regarded...notwithstanding the visitation"¹.

¹ This letter is contained in Egerton Ms. 1693 p. 81 (B. Mus.) a volume of the papers of Walsingham, Elizabeth's minister relating chiefly to ecclesiastical affairs. It is a copy, without name or date, evidently forwarded to Walsingham by Bp. Scory. The same volume contains many papers relating to the visitation named in the letter, which was attended with peculiar difficulties, as the cathedral chapter claimed to be exempt by their charters and privileges "as well from the Archbishop of Canterbury as... from their own bishop." (p. 95. *cf.* Parker's *Corresp.* Parker Soc. p. 165). The visit was eventually managed by Aubery, Vicar General of the archbishop, in virtue of a royal command, and was

That the writer's reminiscences were not incorrect will appear from the account bishop Scory himself gives of the state of feeling in Hereford in 1561, nearly three years after Mary's death. "The popish justices of the city" so runs Scory's plaint "commanded the observance of St. Laurence's day as a holiday. On the eve no butcher in the town ventured to sell meat; on the day itself no 'gospeller' durst work in his occupation or open his shop. A party of recusant priests from Devonshire were received in state by the magistrates, carried through the streets in procession and 'so feasted and magnified' as Christ himself could not have been more reverently entertained." ¹

If it is desired to realize what were the english cathedrals in days gone by, it is only necessary to inquire what the french churches were in the beginning of the last century: a subject for which materials abound. These stately corporations were undoubtedly a prominent feature in the religious life of France up to the era of the great Revolution. Not merely in such small towns as Beauvais or Châlons, where a cathedral establishment might naturally be supposed to overpower all other interests, but in busy centres like Rouen, Amiens or Lyons, they were a real religious power in the life of the city. More than that: as may have been already gathered from the Hereford letter, they were the living manifestations in the country of the public recognition that the people formed a Christian and Catholic nation. On high-days and great days the re-

held sometime between 5 Sept. 1582 and 19 April 1583. The whole story is shortly told in the *Downside Review* Vol. VI pp. 58—61.

¹ Froude. *History*, (ed. 1870) VII p. 19.

representatives of every class and profession, up to the lieutenant of the sovereign, took part in the solemn offices along with the clergy as making up together one corporate whole, and thus publicly proclaimed religion an integral part of the national life.

There were days moreover when the offices of the parish churches were discontinued and the clergy and their flocks assembled within the mother church for one united celebration. Thus the cathedral became essentially a popular institution, even apart from the exceptional splendour with which its services were invested.

The parish churches of England according to their size and wealth followed the model set them by their cathedral ¹. The body of clergy attached to them by one title or another, along with choristers and the numerous clerics in minor orders who lived the life of lay people in secular callings, was much larger than is now generally realized. This made the maintenance of the public office in the larger churches, at least on Sundays and feast-days practicable and even easy. ² It

¹ This is the simple origin of a diocesan "use" and explains naturally and certainly the predominance of the rite of Sarum in southern England. Five of the episcopal sees of the Canterbury province, not including Bath and Coventry, had a monastic cathedral, and as the monastic office and the solemnities entirely differed from those of the secular clergy, the rites of these cathedrals could not furnish the model for the parish and collegiate churches of these dioceses. They were thus perforce obliged to adopt the use of some other and secular cathedral. It is unnecessary to discuss here the reasons which may have led to the adoption of the Sarum rather than any other use.

² The chanting of the office (*i. e. cum nota*) was in the middle ages required even in cases where such practice might at the present day seem useless and impossible. Many such examples occur in the *Registrum Visitationum* of Eudes Rigaud, archbishop of Rouen.

must be remembered also that what are now known as "devotions" were then essentially regarded as private and personal and, besides the mass, the office was the only church service.

The measures of Henry VIII. had at most but slightly touched the parish churches and, so far as the services are concerned they, as little as the cathedrals, had been affected by the suppression of the monasteries. Still, though no practical change had taken place on the accession of Edward, there is evidence that Cranmer had already designed considerable alterations in public worship, the character of which will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II.

CRANMER'S PROJECTED BREVIARY.

More than fifty years ago the late Sir William Palmer pointed out that the breviary of Cardinal Quignon had evidently exercised an influence in the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer. Whole passages in the preface were shown to be either translations or more or less close adaptations of parts of Quignon's own preface to the first edition of his office-book. Here, however, in fact the investigation rested, since it was not possible to attribute the origin of any part or form of the printed english book directly to Quignon's volume. The manuscript to which attention is now invited supplies what has hitherto been wanting to make clear the connection.

It has been mentioned in the last chapter that this manuscript¹ is at least one of the books, if not all, which Convocation in 1547 asked to see. It comprises two schemes of Office² and three tables of lessons. An account of the manuscript and a print

¹ B. Mus. Royal MS. 7 B. IV.

² What is meant by *Office* must be clearly understood. It is not the Mass, which corresponds to the anglican Communion Service, but the canonical hours, which correspond to the matins and evensong of the Common Prayer Book.

Nihil iniqua ab hominibus tanta
cautione excogitatum fuit, aut tanta summatim strabi-
limum, quod delictis et temporum lapsu non corr-
mperetur. Hoc et in precibus illis quas horarias
sive ruminas appellamus, xpi, venisse conspimus.
Quarum rationem a pristinis ecclesie patribus ~
institutum si quis diligenter exquirat et examinet,
eam sane nec inepte nec inordinate ordinatam fuisse
comperiet. Illi siquidem tali modo rem disposuerat,
ut singulis annis omnia sacra biblia perlegeretur,
et una cum anni circulo canonicis quoque scripture
circulus reuolueretur. Volentes minime soli clerici
et ecclesiarum Antistites assidua sacrarum literarum
lectione meditationeque et ipsi ad arduam virtutis
viam rursus inchoandum incitarentur et alios exhortandi
in doctrina sana, convincendi que eos qui contradicunt
facilitatem sibi compararent. et plebes auditis
quotidie in celis sacro sacris domini verbi lectionibus
indies magis ac magis in rerum divinarum cognitione
proficerent ac in domini pietate uterentur. Sed
proh dolor! istam maiorum tum sanctam tum pulchra-
tum bene coherentem ordinationem superueniens sine
qua fcede conspurcaverat convulseratque, et lingua
membratim dilaceraverat. Nam librorum serie
continua et integra nusquam observamus. Sed
vel fragmenta hinc inde decerpimus et confusam
nihil quid precesserat quidve sequatur attendentes,
vel initia tantum librorum delibantes. Duo tribus
decursus capitulis, cetera pretermittimus. Sic librum
ysaie inchoamus. sic librum genesis in septuagesima
inchoamus. sed inchoamus tantum. ad umbilicum

of its contents are given in the appendix: here it will suffice to state results.

It is however well first to point out the grounds upon which this manuscript is attributed to archbishop Cranmer. The schemes of office are, as is evident on the face of them and as will appear more and more clearly the more closely they are examined, of a date earlier than that of the Book of Common Prayer. The first of them, roughly speaking, follows the old order of breviary services, and may be described as Sarum material worked up under Quignon's influence. The second, although also in latin, comes nearer to the form of morning and evening prayer in the first printed Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1549). The preface of this latter scheme, also in latin, is manifestly an earlier draft of the english preface of the book of 1549.

Further, on confronting the Royal MS. with the Harleian MS. 426, (Cranmer's draft of the abortive *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*, which is recognized as being partly in the archbishop's handwriting,) the identity of workmanship and style is unmistakable. The same secretary (Ralph Morrice) writes the body of the book in both cases; in both, after head lines had been written in, blanks are left, as the *Reformatio legum* says "for Mr. Morres" to fill up ¹; in both corrections and annotations are made in the same characteristic manner and by the same hand, which is that of archbishop Cranmer ².

To understand the nature of the earlier scheme it is necessary to give some idea of the mediæval office and that compiled by cardinal Quignon. The seven canonical hours of the church may first be

¹ B. Mus. Harl. MS. 426 f. 17.

² See facsimiles here reduced in size.

divided into night and day office, of which the former making one service or "hour", included matins and lauds and was as long as the other six hours put together.

The body of all the office, whether day or night, was the psalms, including certain scriptural canticles like those of Zachary, the Three Children, and the Blessed Virgin. And what specially characterized matins was the reading of numerous lessons taken from Holy Scripture, the works of the Fathers and the lives of the Saints. In the other "hours" the lessons of scripture were reduced to a few lines, commonly called the "little chapter". These then, the psalms and lessons, were the substance of the office and to them, at dates which naturally it is now impossible to fix exactly, other portions were added which served at once for piety and for convenience in public recitation.

Thus in a body of clergy, as might be presumed, only the few would have either musical aptitude or knowledge. Moreover all could not be supplied with the music. This would naturally bring about the adoption of *antiphons*, which were taken generally from some verse of the psalm about to be sung. The practical use of these antiphons, which were sung by trained cantors in the middle of the choir, was to give the general body of the clergy the tone of the coming psalm. ¹ This reason, which applied in the early ages, was not less cogent at the moment when the ancient offices were superseded in England.

¹ This is somewhat obscured by the present practice, which however counts a respectable antiquity, of saying the antiphon *after* the psalm as well as *before*, but the ancient roman practice gives it only before the psalm (*cf.* Grancolas, *Brév. Romain* livre I. ch. 30).

The antiphon was not less necessary in our long english gothic choirs than in the spacious roman basilicas. ¹

In the same way the use of the *responsory* which was sung at the end of each lesson at matins was dictated by a like practical need. To chant these lessons implies a great strain upon the voice. The response, therefore, drawn from some part of Holy Scripture appropriate to the occasion, and sung partly by the cantors and partly by the choir at large, afforded a welcome and necessary breathing space for the lector.

These antiphons and responsories are so ancient an addition to the psalmody that they may almost be considered a part of the primitive office. The "hymns", although some seem to have been certainly composed by Saint Ambrose for the choral service, were a later element and admitted with the greatest reluctance by the more conservative churches, such as Rome and Lyons. ²

The special feature of late mediæval breviaries, that is to say, of what are called the *uses*, whether english, french, german, italian or monastic, is the lengthening out of the office by the addition of what

¹ Thus whilst the editions of the Sarum breviary were issued by the dozen, one only of the antiphonar appeared. One copy on the cantor's desk would be enough for even a church of the first class. It is probable moreover that the ancient Mss. antiphonars, enormous volumes, executed at great cost, were still used in spite of the printed edition, as they are to the present day at Monte Cassino and Einsiedeln.

² At Rome hymns do not appear to have been admitted into the office till after the twelfth century. Even in the eighteenth Lyons had adopted only the compline hymn. Their general adoption was probably due to the influence of the monastic order. St. Benedict in the sixth century made them part of the office of his monks.

are known as *preces* ¹ and by the accumulation of offices. That is; not content with the "hours" of the day, which were the hours of the church, out of excess of devotion, after each obligatory "hour" the corresponding portion of the merely devotional office of the Blessed Virgin was recited. These also were even at times followed by the office of the dead. And thus three offices were sometimes said in place of one ². Even as early as the twelfth century complaints of this growing practice had made themselves heard, and by the sixteenth century recitation of the office had become a heavy burden upon the clergy. The sense of weariness which must have resulted could not but have a prejudicial effect upon the chanting of the obligatory part of the divine office. There was urgent need of reform, and that carried out by Pius V. in 1568, which swept away the bulk of these late accretions, restored the breviary to a rational and practicable form.

More than thirty years previously however a much more radical change had been almost effected by cardinal Quignon, with the approval and recommendation of the Pope. Quignon was a Spaniard, a member of the Franciscan order, and a trusted friend and confidant of Pope Clement VII. and his successor Paul III. He was one of the leading spirits of the curia and on intimate terms with the small and able

¹ In the anglican Prayer Book the short versicles said after the creed in the Morning Prayer may be taken as a specimen of the ancient *preces*.

² The practice of churches varied considerably in different localities: thus at Sarum only the Matins and Vespers of the Blessed Virgin were recited in choir, the other "hours" being said privately.

body of ecclesiastics who ardently at that time desired reform.

He had been commissioned by Clement VII. to draw up a breviary but the work only appeared after that Pope's death. The volume was dedicated to Paul III. and was published in February 1535 under the title *Breviarium Romanum nuper reformatum*. Prefixed to it was a commendatory brief from the Pope.

The changes proposed were so radical that notwithstanding the Pope's favour the new breviary raised a storm of opposition. The Sorbonne distinguished itself especially by the vigour of its condemnation. Quignon felt it prudent to make concessions and issued a revised text intended in some measure to meet the objections taken to his first edition. During the short space, however, of the eighteen months in which the first text was current, no less than six editions appeared at Rome, Venice, Paris and Antwerp¹.

That this reformed roman breviary met a real need is evident from the number of editions published: those of the second text being "probably not far short of a hundred". This latter text need not be here considered, for it is certain from the preface of the Book of Common Prayer that Cranmer made use of the earlier edition². And, although the archbishop's

¹ "These are all the editions of the first text that I have met with" writes its recent editor; "no doubt there are others still undiscovered, although I have searched carefully in many libraries in Italy and also in France." *Brev. Romanum a Francisco Card. Quignorio ed: curante Johanne Wickham Legg*. Cambridge. 1888.

² The prefaces to the two texts of Cardinal Quignon's breviary differ very materially, and in the preface of the Prayer Book Cranmer uses passages of Quignon's first preface which do not appear in the second.

scheme includes antiphons, there is no sufficient evidence that he derived this feature from Quignon's revised text. The following remarks therefore apply only to the earlier edition.

The first thing that strikes any one accustomed to the ancient breviaries, on glancing through Quignon's volume, is the absence of all antiphons, responses and little chapters, the reduction of the *preces* to very narrow limits, and the entire omission of every office but that of the day¹. His main concern was to secure in practice the regular reading of the Scriptures. This of course was the original intention and practice of the church, which, however, traditions and the rubrics of the later breviaries had partially neutralized.

The parts omitted obviously shortened the office, which was further curtailed by reducing the number of psalms at matins, lauds, vespers and compline to three. The frame-work however of the breviary, and the number and disposition of the hours, remained the same.

Quignon's arrangement of the Holy Scripture was dictated by his wish that the chief books of the Old Testament and all the New should be read through during the year. "Every day throughout the year", he writes in his preface, "the first (lesson at matins) is from the Old Testament, the second from the New, and the third from the life of a Saint if a feast be celebrated; but if there be no such feast, the Acts and Epistles are read in this third lesson in the order noted in the Calendar"².

¹ i. e. he put aside such *votive* offices as those of the B. V. Mary and the 'Dead'. Quignon calls special attention to this in his preface: his object being to get rid of whatever "interfered with the reading of Holy Scripture".

² *ed.*: J. W. Legg. p. XXI.

One other important feature of this new breviary must be noticed. In the old office books there were numerous variations in the service according as the day was a sunday, feastday, or weekday. By Quignon's plan such variations were reduced to a minimum. "In my (book)" he writes "there is no difference, or very little, in the days of the entire year and so far as length is concerned sunday and weekday are the same. The first and second lessons, moreover, are disposed in an unchangeable order throughout the year".

The reader will now be in a position to estimate the general character of Cranmer's new scheme of office. In the appendix will be found an indication of the sources from which this was drawn, and it will be shown as far as possible in detail how far Cranmer was indebted to Quignon, how far to Sarum, and how far the work appears to be original. In this place again only general results can be given.

In the disposition of the ecclesiastical year the archbishop appears not to have come to a definite conclusion when drafting his scheme. The body of the book shows the ancient Sarum arrangement, whilst the table of lessons drawn up by his own hand adopts the changes initiated by cardinal Quignon.

Cranmer's proposed office consisted of the ancient hours of matins and lauds, prime, tierce, sext, none, vespers and compline.

The latin language is retained even for the reading of Scripture throughout the year.

The distribution of the psalter is unfortunately indicated only by the general direction in each hour "*psalmi ex ordine designati*". As, however, the number of lessons at matins was reduced ordinarily to three, and three psalms are expressly prescribed for each of the last three days of Holy Week, it may

fairly be conjectured that Quignon was also to be followed in the reduction of the psalms at matins, lauds, vespers and compline to three.

Differing from Quignon's first breviary, Cranmer allowed one antiphon at each hour; but like his model he omitted the responses and little chapters.

Another significant change from the old order is found both in Quignon and Cranmer. In the breviaries formerly in use the portion called the *temporale* begins with vespers: the feast being then, as now, regarded as commencing with the vesper service of the eve. Both the cardinal and the archbishop begin their *temporale* with the office of matins.

The table of lessons in Cranmer's scheme of office, following the old ecclesiastical tradition, begins with the first Sunday of Advent. Besides the three lessons directed to be said at matins, one is appointed to be read at lauds and another at vespers, which, although longer, may be taken to represent the ancient little chapters, omitted by Quignon altogether.

In another most important matter Cranmer's first scheme adopts Quignon's plan of reducing the variable parts of the service, and he even goes beyond his model in this direction. The office of one day was made exactly similar to every other throughout the year, except in the Holy Week and on one or two feasts for which special directions were given.

Those who are particularly interested in the matter will find on examination unmistakable and repeated instances of the way in which Cranmer's scheme of office, both in its general order and in detail, was inspired by Quignon's roman breviary.¹

¹ See the print of the scheme in the Appendix. It is remarkable that in the catalogue of the library of Henry VIII., dated

The relation of the projected office to that of Sarum is more simple. The archbishop appears to have used this breviary as a quarry from which to take his materials, when not quite satisfied with the new roman office. It must be allowed that what he does take from the ancient english sources is used in a somewhat unscrupulous fashion. Thus, for example, a little chapter is turned into an antiphon, the old position of various parts is changed without apparent reason, and snipping and cutting indulged in, in what seems to have been an arbitrary way. Still it must be added that in places he enriches the modern baldness of Quignon from the ancient Catholic storehouse of Sarum.

Two questions remain for consideration: when was this scheme drawn up, and under whose influence? It is always unsatisfactory to deal with a dateless document like this, the contents of which necessarily afford but the slightest indication of time. Under such circumstances all that can be done is to see where it best fits in with the events or the tendencies of particular minds. What follows therefore must be taken merely as conjecture, made however after careful examination.

The Convocation of 1542, as already noted, directed that the Sarum office should be generally adopted for the province of Canterbury. It gave also a second ritual direction: namely "that the curate of every church after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* shall

24 April 1542, which appears to contain all the books of the royal chapel except one or two missals, three breviaries only are mentioned, each of which is entered in full as "*Breviarium Romanum*". It is hardly perhaps too much to suppose that these were copies of Quignon's volume. Another volume is described as "*Ceremonie Ecclesie Romane*" (R. O. Augt. Office Misc: Bk: 160. f. 128^a. 108^b).

openly read unto the people one chapter of the New Testament in english... and when the New Testament is read over, then to begin the Old".

By this order a chapter of the Bible was to be read to the people in english twice on every day of public service: in the early morning after matins and in the afternoon at vespers. This measure was a distinct break from the traditional order of service although it certainly had a precedent in the arrangement made by Luther and by this time (1542) common in german reformed churches.

"Here then at this point" writes Canon Dixon "rested the revision of the public service... The old books were ordered to be called in and castigated. If the order was ever enforced the books after their expurgation must have been restored to the churches whence they were taken; but it is more likely nothing was done" ¹.

The document known as the *Rationale*, or exposition of the order of divine service in mass and office, is unfortunately also dateless and anonymous, but there is great probability in the theory put forward by Canon Dixon that it is really the outcome of the ritual commission appointed by Henry VIII. in 1540. In this document "the succession and connection of the various parts of the great Catholic rites were exhibited with lucidity and even with brevity. All the dispute ceremonies were maintained. The liturgic principles of the remarkable *Rationale* must have been highly obnoxious to Cranmer and it is probable enough that it was he who prevented it from seeing the light" ².

In the Convocation of 1543 Cranmer made his own

¹ *History of Church of England* II, 316.

² *Ibid.* p. 313.

proposal for liturgical reform. "He declared it to be the royal will that all mass books, antiphoners, portasses in the church of England should be newly examined, reformed and castigated from all manner of mention of the bishop of Rome's name; from all apocryphas, feigned legends, superstitious orations, collects, versicles and responses: that the names and memories of all saints which were not contained in the Scripture or authentic doctors should be abolished and put out of the same books and calendars, and that the service should be made out of the Scriptures and other authentic doctors". The examination was committed to the bishops of Salisbury and Ely, Capon and Goodrich, and to six of the lower House; but this committee was not formed, the lower House declining to appoint" ¹.

Whether Capon and Goodrich did anything does not appear, but, in the light now thrown on the question by the hitherto neglected Royal MS. it seems practically certain that some steps were taken to prepare for the proposed change. The scheme now brought under notice corresponds so closely to the programme proposed by Cranmer to the Convocation of 1543, that even if the MS. did not evidence his own hand, there could be little doubt that this projected order of service was his.

As to the exact date then, it is possible that the archbishop may have had his material for the proposed book already prepared to present to the commission which convocation failed to appoint. But it is far more probable that seeing the failure of his attempt to induce the synod of the english Church to take up the matter, he turned his own attention

¹ Ibid p. 315. The original is somewhat obscure: "But this the lower House released" (Wilkins. III. 863). The gloss is Strype's.

to it, and that consequently the document is to be assigned to some date between 1543 and Henry's death in January 1547 ¹.

That it is certainly of a date prior to Edward's accession will be clear from a consideration of the doctrinal points of the book. In the office of the feast of Corpus Christi for instance the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament as maintained by Henry is unmistakably expressed ².

It may perhaps be considered unnecessary to raise the question as to the influence under which Cranmer probably drew up his scheme : but the enquiry leads to a consideration which might easily escape attention and which is of considerable importance. The choice of Quignon's work for a model has an aspect almost eirenical. At the time it must have seemed more than probable that the Quignon breviary would before very long become the recognized office book of the roman church. Its ready and general acceptance on this side of the Alps gave promise that it would become the common breviary of the West. To take the Quignon text therefore showed some disposition, so far from widening the breach caused in England by the separation from Rome, to keep to points of contact with the Western church as far as possible.

¹ In 1546 Cranmer strove to gain his end through the king. He went so far as to draw up a draft letter which he proposed that Henry should adopt as his own. In this bishops Day of Chichester and Heath of Worcester are represented as pressing with Cranmer for liturgical change. The King appears not to have entered into Cranmer's projects, for nothing more is heard of the matter (Burnet II. 2. pp. 236—7).

² The Invitatory for this feast is: *Christum salvatorem et panem vite celestis, Venite adoremus*. This is not the same as Sarum or Quignon, but original.

This was hardly Cranmer's natural disposition. It was however much the temper of Tunstall of Durham, for whom during twenty years the archbishop had the deepest friendship. To these ties Cranmer was faithful to the last. His voice alone was raised in Parliament in Tunstall's favour, when that prelate's ruin had been resolved on by King and Council.

Looking round then on all the most prominent ecclesiastics of the day, the tone and temper of Tunstall's mind, his moderation, his wise conservatism, his openness to new ideas and his acquaintance with men of the new era, seem to point to him as the most likely counsellor of Cranmer in this matter.¹

¹ It is necessary here to notice a suggestion of Canon Dixon in regard to the *Rationale* spoken of above. He says: "if it had come into Convocation it would have passed": again "I am sure it was never brought before Convocation, for I have no doubt that it was the document which Convocation in the first year of Edward VI. requested Cranmer to produce" (p. 313. *see* p. 16 *ante*). The words of Convocation itself and of Cranmer make this suggestion hardly probable. The *Rationale* is merely an account of the divine service and cannot in any sense be called a revision of the service books. It still less suits Cranmer's version of the petition of Convocation, for he speaks of an appointment "to alter the service in the church and to devise other convenient and uniform order" and notes that the "said books" were to be "for a better exposition of the divine service to be set forth accordingly". This is a good description of the purpose of the scheme contained in the Royal MS. Further, Cranmer stated to Convocation in 1543 that it was "the royal will" that the new books should be framed, and this accords with his note in 1547, "by the commandment of King Henry VIII." rather than with the other version "*ex mandato Convocationis*".

CHAPTER III.

CRANMER'S SECOND PROJECT.

Archbishop Cranmer's second scheme for the public office may be briefly dismissed. It is however of considerable importance and interest, as marking the step whereby he passed from the ancient arrangement of the divine office to the order for morning and evening prayer which was eventually put forth in the Prayer Book of 1549.

The daily services were in this scheme reduced to two, namely matins and vespers. "We have thought good" it says "to omit compline altogether and also the accustomed hours, prime, tierce, sext and none, as well because in all these there is a continual repetition of the same things, which is idle and useless, as because it seems a mockery to retain the same divisions of the hours observed by the ancient fathers, when the custom of praying seven times a day has long since ceased and we now assemble only twice a day for prayers"¹.

In the second place, the matins and vespers were to be said as hitherto in latin, except the Lord's Prayer and the lessons of Holy Scripture, which were directed to be recited in english. These last were to be read from the pulpit or some other place out-

¹ Ms. Reg. 7 B. IV, f. 11b.

side the choir. The psalter was to be gone through once in the month, and the general rubric regulating the recital is much the same as it now stands in the present Book of Common Prayer.

The daily order of Matins was as follows: after the *Our Father* said aloud in english, there followed the *Domine labia mea aperies* &c.¹ The *Venite* was omitted altogether. "It has seemed sufficient" says the rubric "that this should be recited among the rest of the psalms in its ordinary course once a month"². Next came a hymn varied according to the day of the week or the season of the year. Then followed in order three psalms, *Our Father* in english, three lessons from the Holy Scriptures³, *Te Deum* and *Benedictus*, the salutation *Dominus vobiscum*, and the prayer varying according to the time of the year. The service closed with the *Benedicamus Domino* to which a new response was given.

On sundays and feastdays a fourth lesson was to be said after the *Te Deum*, which was directed to be taken, either from some homily of the Fathers, or from the life of a saint. On sundays also after the *Benedicamus Domino* there were added to the service, the Athanasian Creed, the *preces*, which still survive in the Book of Common Prayer, with the Collect, now called "for grace".

The order of vespers was the same on all days of the year and followed that of the daily matins, except that two lessons were read in place of three,

¹ This is the arrangement of the present Prayer Book after the absolution.

² Ibid. f. 11a.

³ These were preceded in the traditional way by the *Jube Domine* with the blessing given by the officiant, and closed with the *Tu autem*.

and the *Magnificat* replaced the *Te Deum*. After the canticle the prayer was said, and the service closed in the usual way.

It will be seen therefore that this project, though on the same lines as that which subsequently appeared in the printed Book of 1549, is somewhat more simple. The vespers are drawn entirely from the old vespers service; the daily morning services comprise certain features of the ancient matins with the *Benedictus* drawn from lauds; and on sundays the Athanasian creed, the *preces* and the collect 'for grace' taken from prime.

Of the numerous hymns of the old breviaries twenty-six were retained; fourteen being assigned to the days of the week and the other twelve to the ecclesiastical seasons of Christmas, Passiontide, Holy Week, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost.

The variable collects were reduced in the same way. Of the five and thirty prayers retained, whilst one was assigned to each of the sundays after Pentecost, only ten had to serve for the ecclesiastical seasons from Advent to Pentecost inclusively.

Considerable difficulty seems to have been experienced in settling the calendar which is the key to all office books on the traditional lines. The Royal MS., which contains these projects of archbishop Cranmer, comprises two schemes of a calendar for saints and three schemes of a table of lessons from Scripture, besides an imperfect draft of a *festivale* or series of fourth lessons for saints' days. Each of these elements of the entire project must be considered in turn. To take first the two calendars of saints' days. These are markedly distinct in character and there is little difficulty in placing them in their correct order of date. The earlier differs from the traditional calendar only by the paucity



March

Matutine

Serper

	Matutine	Prima	Secunda	Tercio	Prima	Secunda
	Genary	Lectio	Lectio	Lectio	Lectio	Lectio
1 Martii	1	30 Numeri 1	16	12	Numeri 2	
2 nonas	2	1	3	13	4	
3 nonas	3	2	4	14	6	Coloff
4 nonas	4	3	7	15	7	
5 nonas	5	4	8	16	9	
6 nonas	6	5	10	17	11	
7 idus	7	6	12	18	13	1 Chiff
8 idus	8	7	14	19	15	
9 idus	9	8	15	20	16	
10 idus	10	9	16	21	17	
11 idus	11	10	18	22	19	
12 idus	12	11	20	23	21	2 Chiff
13 idus	13	12	22	24	23	
14 idus	14	13	24	25	25	
15 idus	15	14	26	26	26	1 Cmo
16 kal	16	15	27	28	28	
17 kal	17	16	29	30	30	
18 kal	18	17	31	31	31	
19 kal	19	18	33	33	33	
20 kal	20	19	35	35	35	
21 kal	21	20	37	37	37	
22 kal	22	21	39	39	39	
23 kal	23	22	41	41	41	
24 kal	24	23	43	43	43	
25 kal	25	24	45	45	45	
26 kal	26	25	47	47	47	
27 kal	27	26	49	49	49	
28 kal	28	27	51	51	51	
29 kal	29	28	53	53	53	
30 kal	30	29	55	55	55	
31 kal	31	30	57	57	57	

Aprilis

1 Aprilis	1	1	23	1	19	23
2 nonas	2	2	24	6	20	24
3 nonas	3	3	26	6	21	27
4 nonas	4	4	28	7	22	29
5 nonas	5	5	29	7	23	30
6 idus	6	6	31	8	24	31
7 idus	7	7	33	9	25	33
8 idus	8	8	35	10	26	35
9 idus	9	9	37	11	27	37
10 idus	10	10	39	12	28	39
11 idus	11	11	41	13	29	41
12 idus	12	12	43	14	30	43
13 idus	13	13	45	15	31	45
14 idus	14	14	47	16	32	47
15 idus	15	15	49	17	33	49
16 idus	16	16	51	18	34	51
17 idus	17	17	53	19	35	53
18 idus	18	18	55	20	36	55
19 idus	19	19	57	21	37	57
20 idus	20	20	59	22	38	59
21 idus	21	21	61	23	39	61
22 idus	22	22	63	24	40	63
23 idus	23	23	65	25	41	65
24 idus	24	24	67	26	42	67
25 idus	25	25	69	27	43	69
26 idus	26	26	71	28	44	71
27 idus	27	27	73	29	45	73
28 idus	28	28	75	30	46	75
29 idus	29	29	77	31	47	77
30 idus	30	30	79	32	48	79
31 idus	31	31	81	33	49	81

Facsimile III. (to face p. 33).

The later calendar showing alterations in Cranmer's hand. (MS. Reg 7 B. IV f. 4b).

of saints' names which are entered in it. Not a single english name is to be found in the entire list: that of St. Gregory the Great is in fact the only one connected with England. Of the festivals of the Blessed Virgin, the Purification, Annunciation, Assumption and Nativity are preserved as well as the feast of St. Anne. A special characteristic of this scheme appears to be the retention of the names of the great Fathers of the Church. There would seem to be one trace of the influence of Quignon in the insertion of the feast of SS. Phileas and Philoromus at the third of February, whilst the calendar gives already, in the insertion of the festival of St. Timothy on 22 January and St. Benjamin on 21 February, an indication of the spirit which presided at the compilation of the later calendar.

Of this second proposal for a new calendar for the english church it is difficult to speak seriously, or to believe it could be meant in earnest were it not that the correcting hand of Cranmer has attempted to reduce it to a more reasonable form, and that the projected *festivale* is actually drawn up on the lines which it lays down. It may be described in one sentence as scripturalism without discretion. It commemorates Abel, Noe, the good Thief, Benjamin, Lydia and Deborah, Gideon and Sampson, Booz and the Centurion, king David and Nathan, Judith and Esther with others. At the same time it bears traces of having been a further development of the former calendar. Two english saints are now admitted, St. Edward, king and martyr, and St. Edmund the king.

The correcting hand introduced some measure of sense by adding old familiar feasts like those of St. Agnes and St. Vincent, the Invention of the Holy Cross, St. Cuthbert, St. Augustine of Canterbury and

St. Alban. But saints Phileas and Philoromus maintain their ground, and Cranmer's annotations in the *festivale* refer to the *Breviarium Romanum* as a source from which lives of saints may be taken.

On comparing these schemes with the calendar of feasts which actually appeared in the Prayer Book of 1549 it is not difficult to understand the situation. There were clearly contrary influences at work, the one advocating the ancient calendar somewhat purged of its objectionable elements, the other insisting upon Scripture being the primary basis. What was actually done in 1549 was to retain such feasts as could be distinctly referred to the New Testament. That is, putting aside those of Our Lord, the feasts were reduced to those of the Apostles, the Purification and Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin, St. John the Baptist, St. Mary Magdalen, St. Stephen and the Holy Innocents, with the addition of St. Michael as a commemoration of the angels, and of the one general celebration of All Saints.

The kernel of the new office lay in the novel tables of lessons of which the manuscript gives three schemes. These must be taken in connection with that which appeared in the print of the first Book of Common Prayer. It has been already pointed out that the earliest scheme of lessons is written in Cranmer's own hand and adopts the arrangement of the ecclesiastical year made in Quignon's breviary. In the distribution of the Bible throughout the year, however, like the later schemes it is original and cannot be referred to any earlier breviary, although, as might be expected in one who had long used the Sarum office, there are traces of the influence of the Salisbury use¹. This scheme of course belongs to

¹ For example: the lessons of Advent are taken from Isaias,

Post 1^a Post 2^a Post 3^a ad lund ad voff
 circa 4^a Augustini

Amot	1	Amot	2	16	18	Amot	3
	4		5	16	18		5
	6		7	17	19		8
	9		9	17	19	Adriab	1
mat	1		2	18	19		3
	4	apostab	1	18	19		5
	7		47	19	19		7

circa 5^a Augustini

San.	1	San	2	19	20	San	3
Abacur	1	Abacur	2	19	20	Abacur	3
Oppro.	1	Oppro	2	20	20	Oppro	3
Agro.	1	Agro	2	20	20	Agro	3
Zachar	1	Zachar	2	20	20	Zachar	3
	14		14	21	21	yalach	1
	2		3	21	21		4

Ex his lateribus quoniam ante septuagesimam no legitur, legende
 fut opimus ante adnotu simplici quousqz numerus
 ex his lateribus ante + hoc loco deest, suppletur ut 6360
 mada 23 post pentecosten p adnotu du

circa 70^{us}

Comptie	1	Compt	1	yalat.	4	21	Compt	2
	3		3	4	4	21		4
	4		5	5	5	21		5
	6		7	5	5	22		7
	8		9	5	5	22		11
	11		12	6	6	22		13
	14		14	6	6	22		15

circa 80^{us}

16	17	7	22	17
18	18	7	23	19
19	20	8	23	21
21	22	8	23	23
24	24	9	23	24
26	25	9	24	25
	26	10	24	27

circa 90^{us}

27	28	10	24	29
29	30	11	24	30
31	31	11	24	31
32			25	32
34	33	12	25	34
37	35	12	25	37
	38	12	25	38

circa 100^{us}

Facsimile IV. (to face p. 34).

Draft of a table of lessons in Cranmer's hand. (MS. Reg. 7 B. IV f. 152a).

the projected breviary described in the last chapter.

Passing to the next in order of date a significant change occurs in the arrangement. The first scheme was made to depend upon the ecclesiastical year, the portions of Holy Scripture being assigned to the various seasons of Advent, Epiphany, Lent, &c. The second was regulated entirely by the days of the month, and the commencement of the book of Genesis was transferred from Septuagesima, as in the traditional office, to January the third. In other words the ecclesiastical year was abandoned in favour of the calendar year, and this was maintained in the Prayer Book of 1549 and its successors. The steps by which the present arrangement of the lessons from Scripture was arrived at are interesting but the details must be sought in the appendix. Here it will be sufficient to note that in none of the schemes was the continuous reading of Scripture interrupted. Special lessons were first assigned for the ordinary Sunday office in 1559, and however the distribution of the lessons varied the actual amount of Scripture read from any book remained almost the same throughout; but the variations also show how closely linked together are these three schemes and that which was printed in the first Book of Common Prayer.

The plan of morning and evening service adopted in this second project can have no pretence to originality. For five and twenty years such services had been in use in the Lutheran parts of Germany where the ancient ritual books had, as in this case, been used as the quarry out of which the materials for the new forms of prayer were drawn. It must be re-

those after the Epiphany from Romans and Corinthians, whilst Genesis was commenced on Septuagesima Sunday.

membered however that so far as these services were concerned their conception and their similarity were due less to acquaintance with the new books than to intercourse with men who had used them. There are features however which distinguish the english services contemplated by Cranmer from those which owed their origin exclusively to Lutheran inspiration. The german reformer, however violent may have been his language always held firmly the principle of liturgical tolerance. Writing in 1545 to the Prince of Anhalt, Luther says: "I cannot recommend the plan of a uniformity of ceremonies in every place".¹

In reviewing the manuscript projects in connection with the Book of 1549, it is impossible not to see how Cranmer's mind constantly tended to greater rigidity in these matters. The projects not merely witness to a desire for a uniformity of observance throughout the country; but all churches alike, from the cathedral with its numerous clergy, singing men and boys, to that of the smallest village, were confined by the Book of Common Prayer to a single type of service, which was made as nearly as possible the same for every day throughout the year.

It may be that the ancient office manifested a superabundant richness of varying devotional forms, but the new order certainly runs to the opposite extreme. Without doubt subsequent revisions of the Book of Common Prayer have introduced elements, which, although it may not be easy to justify them by the test of antiquity, have given to the daily service a breadth or even a certain dignity which is altogether wanting in the book of 1549.

One further feature in the manuscript of the second project remains to be noticed. The whole scheme is

¹ Quoted in Jacoby's *Liturgik der Reformatoren*, I, p. 237.

introduced by a latin preface of which that of the present Prayer Book is little more than a translation. There are however variants which deserve attention. In the first place in the enumeration of the english "uses" the latin omits the mention of that of Lincoln, but adds "those of the manifold orders of religious, each one of which had its own special use". Further, passages from Quignon's preface to his breviary are given in the latin draft, which were subsequently left out in the english version. Quignon's measured and telling criticism of the lessons from saints' lives, in this preface to the second project takes another colour, and its author was doubtless well advised in omitting from the preface to the Prayer Book his remarks on "old wives' fables and the stupidity of those who had put them together". The following passage which could not of course be made to suit the printed book is interesting. "We have left" the latin preface says "only a few hymns which appeared to be more ancient and more beautiful than the rest and the histories of certain saints as to whom no doubt can be raised. These we have caused to be gathered from fitting authorities greek and latin. Moreover, we have only rejected those saints whose solemnities we saw to be wrongly and superstitiously observed by the common people, or whose lives and conduct appeared to us open to exception, or whose history was not recorded by approved authors".¹

It may be further remarked in regard to passages often quoted from the printed preface to the Prayer Book, that they were perfectly appropriate as used by Quignon from whom they were derived, but even in the first scheme were already out of place. Thus Quignon could say with justice that on a candid con-

¹ Royal Ms. 7B.IV. f. 8a.

sideration of the original intention of our forefathers in regard to the divine office, it would be acknowledged that his book was not so much a novel invention as the restoration of the ancient breviary. In the latin draft of his preface, adapting this Cranmer says: "You have here a form of prayer not newly invented by us but rather the ancient one handed down by the fathers and restored to its primitive use and pristine beauty". In the printed english preface he makes a more modest, but less intelligible, claim. "So here you have", he says, "an order for prayer (as touching the reading of Holy Scripture) much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old fathers". A recent writer has remarked that Cranmer was in error in attributing the order of lessons from Scripture to the Fathers of the church, although his expressions are perfectly correct when applied to the mediæval breviaries. The writer did not know that the passage to which he took exception was derived from Quignon, but had been applied by Cranmer to a book in which the distinctive features of the breviary had been abandoned.¹

Finally the order for morning and evening prayer ends with the following advertisement: "we do not wish that any one be bound, as regards the recital of matins and vespers, to anything more than is here set down". This of course relates to the obligation under which priests lay to recite the entire

¹ See the interesting tract by E. Ranke *Der Fortbestand des herkömmlichen Pericopenkreises*. Gotha, 1859, pp. 53—4. — The writer's judgment of the Anglican calendar of lessons seems more equitable than that of Kliefoth, but [it is to be noticed that the two features he selects for commendation are not Cranmer's, whilst that which he specially criticises is of the archbishop's own devising.

divine office either privately or in public, and thus contemplates the private recitation of the usual "Hours". The Prayer Book of 1549 relaxes the obligation of private recitation altogether, but this was reimposed in the second Book of 1552.

The general rubrics of this project are closed by a "Canon" as to the shortening of ecclesiastical prayers for the sake of preaching. After noticing the advantages which will ensue from this exercise, "therefore" (says the canon) "lest the length of the public prayers here established by us should in any way hinder the work of good pastors in teaching their flock, we will that as often as any sermon is preached to the people, the parish priest may omit the *Te Deum*, the fourth lesson and the Athanasian creed in the public prayers before the people".¹

It only remains to consider the probable date at which this scheme of morning and evening prayer was drawn up. The alteration of the calendar and the omission of all provision for a hymn and collect for the festival of Corpus Christi make it almost certain that the scheme does not belong to the reign of Henry VIII. On the other hand it certainly dates before the compilation of the printed Book of Common Prayer and clearly manifests traces of having been used for that work. It may safely therefore be assigned to an early period in the reign of Edward VI.

¹ Cf. in the Prayer Book of 1549 the last note on ceremonies.

CHAPTER IV.

PREPARATIONS FOR CHANGE.

So long as Henry lived the English church, although deprived of some dignity and strength, in her outward appearance remained unchanged. Her system of worship was the same as it had been for many generations, but her chief prelate Cranmer was prepared to suggest innovations and had ready in hand a scheme that was revolutionary. To maintain the old order in the great churches of the realm one thing was absolutely necessary: ample revenues to support a large body of clergy with their attendant ministers. The old elaborate ritual must necessarily be curtailed or altogether swept away if the ecclesiastical revenues were diminished or entirely alienated from their original purposes. A small establishment would quite suffice for the public service on the simple model now projected by Cranmer. Whether he had in mind the spoliation of the church or a redistribution of its wealth is very doubtful, but it is certain that the simplicity of his proposed ritual rendered confiscation possible, and would therefore highly commend it to the men who were now to come into supreme power.

Henry VIII. died at Westminster on Friday, 28 January 1547, at two o'clock in the morning.

Parliament was then sitting; but the king's death was kept secret for nearly three days. On Monday, 31 January, the Commons were sent for to the House of Lords and the Lord Chancellor Wriothesley acquainted them with the event.

Edward, at the moment of his father's death, was at Hertford. His uncle, the Earl of Hertford, afterwards the Duke of Somerset, was in London but hastened at once to join his nephew. Before leaving the city, however, it is clear that he had made all the arrangements needful for seizing the supreme power. Scarcely twenty four hours after Henry's death he wrote to Paget from Hertford a letter dated 29 January, between three and four o'clock in the morning, sent by a messenger, bidden to "haste, post haste, haste with all diligence for thy life, for thy life". The object of the letter was to intimate, "that for divers respects, I think it not convenient to satisfy the world" as to the contents of Henry's will, and saying that between this and Wednesday (February 2) "we to meet and agree therein as there may be no controversy hereafter".¹

Even Edward himself, although in his uncle's keeping, was not informed of his father's death until they had made the journey from Hertford to Enfield. "We intend," writes Hertford in a second letter, "from Enfield, this Sunday night at eleven of the clock," that the "King's Majesty shall be a-horseback tomorrow by eleven so that by three we trust his Grace shall be at the Tower".

The announcement in Parliament of the names of the executors of Henry's will, who were to constitute the Privy Council and exercise all the authority of

¹ Tytler, *Reigns of Edw. VI and Mary*. I. pp. 15—16.

the crown during Edward's minority, raised murmurs of surprise and distrust. How much of the contents of the will was made public is not known; but it would seem that the Earl of Hertford's plan, sketched in his letter of 29 January, was followed. His direction to Paget was "to have the will presently with you and to show this is the will, naming unto them severally who the executors are that the king did specially trust, and who be counsellors".

The first proceedings of the Council within a week of the king's arrival in London, and before Henry was buried, indicated the spirit with which they were prepared to manage even the most weighty matters of ecclesiastical administration. Under Henry, however strong his will and masterful his mind even as supreme head, the old forms of ecclesiastical government retained an ecclesiastical aspect. Under Edward, year by year not merely was all ecclesiastical power wholly absorbed by the King, the Council and their lay agents; but all care to preserve even the outward forms was disregarded and the administration of the Church appeared as a mere department of the State.

On Sunday, 6 February, in pursuance of this policy, the Council assembled at the Tower resolved; "Item whereas all the bishops of the realm had authority of spiritual jurisdiction by force of instruments under the seal appointed *ad res ecclesiasticas* which was determined by the decease of our late Sovereign lord King Henry VIII . . . and for as much as for the better order of the affairs of the realm it is thought convenient the same authority be renewed unto them; it was therefore ordained . . . that they should cause new instruments to be drawn in form of the others they had before . . . and thereupon every of the said bishops to exercise their jurisdiction in such manner

as they did before by virtue of their former grants".¹

At this Council both Cranmer and Tunstall were present, and in compliance with the order the archbishop took out his new commission on the following day.² The whole tone of this document, professing as it does that "all ecclesiastical jurisdiction" proceeded from the king "as well as secular", is sufficient to show that the taking out of these commissions was regarded as a necessary part of the programme, even if the Council Book had not recorded its positive order. In fact it was an immediate announcement of the cardinal point of the whole ecclesiastical policy of Edward's reign. The bishops were to be mere delegates of the King.

Whether Cranmer found any imitators among the bishops in thus immediately complying with the order of the Council, of which he was one of the most important members, does not appear; but it is worthy of note that Tunstall's name disappears early from the documents issuing from the Council board³.

¹ Council Book Harl. MS. 2308 f. 25 d.

² This order of the Council appears to have been commonly overlooked and the proceeding has been attributed to the initiative of Cranmer. The impression that has generally prevailed may be conveniently given in the words used by Canon Dixon. "Even before the prince was crowned" he writes "it came into the mind of Cranmer, so great was his loyalty, that it was desirable for himself and the other bishops to renew their commissions as functionaries of the new King. He therefore issued or caused to be issued again without delay those curious instruments" &c. (Hist. II, p. 413). "Desirable" seems hardly the word to use in view of the proem of the commission itself printed in Burnet (II. 2. p. 90), who seems to have seen the Council order, since he says (II p. 6) "and the bishops were *required* to take out new commissions".

³ After the first three weeks of this reign his signature does not

One bishop certainly objected, and from his own words it may be taken that he spoke in the name of the rest. The full meaning of this novel order did not escape the keen sight of that "ignorant" or "ignorant and subtle lawyer" as Cranmer designates Gardiner, the great opponent of his innovating tendencies. For nearly a month the jurisdiction of the bishop of Winchester over his diocese must have been suspended pending the result of the correspondence he had on the matter with the Council. His objections are best stated in his own words. In a letter of 1 March to "Master Secretary Paget" he writes: "Being the matter of the expedition of our commissions committed to you, these (letters) shall be to require you to expedite them favourably as ye promised me you would. This day I have seen your addition which I like not; for we be called ordinaries of the realm, and there should be a request on our parts to make ourselves delegates. And I have been exercised on making of treaties, where words (as ye know) have been thrust in to signify somewhat at length and then have such an interpretation as may serve. And we poor bishops be not such a match as the parties be in treaties...It would be a marvellous matter if after my long service and the love of my master (Henry VIII), I should offend in going about to do well, to see things well by visitations and receiving of convicts to my charge as ordinary, and am but a delegate. Ye must grant archdeacons authority to visit or they cannot pay their tenths, for thereupon their profit doth arise, and then how shall it stand, the archdeacons to have more authority than the bishop, having in his name to be overseer and yet

appear on the Privy Seals with those of the other councillors, except once in May and twice in June of this year.

may not go see. And now is the time when such as have office to order the people should rather have more committed to them than less. And there is no man I think so made as will adventure further than the evident speech of the commission will bear... I write generally unto you for all and specially for my lord of London. For like as the brethren have made a ballad and solace themselves in it, where Bonner lamenteth the fall of Winchester, so for recompense of his lamentation I speak in his cause, with whom I perceive ye be offended, justly or no I will not reason for I know not, nor have been, on my fidelity, ever spoken to by him of it"¹.

Gardiner had been, as he himself declares, in Paget's youth "his tutor and teacher; afterwards his master, then his beneficial master" obtaining from Henry "one of the rooms of the clerkship of the signet for him"². The tone of Paget's reply to his old master is extraordinary. It is dated March 2, the day after Gardiner had written his request, and it must have shown the bishop that there was no room for appeal against a policy already decided upon. "I malign not bishops" he writes "but would that both they and all other were in such order as might be most to the glory of God and the benefit of this realm. And if the estate of bishops is or shall be thought meet to be reformed, I wish either that you were no bishop, or that you could have such a pliable will as could well bear the reformation that should be thought meet for the quiet of the realm".

"Your lordship shall have your commission in as ample manner as I have authority to make out the same, and in an ampler manner than you had it

¹ State Papers. Dom. Ed. VI. Vol I. No. 24.

² Foxe's *Acts* ed. Townsend, VI. p. 259.

before. No man wisheth you better than I do, which is as well as to myself; if you wish me not like, you are in the wrong; and thus I take my leave of your lordship”¹.

Another matter affecting the interests of the church was as easily settled and the course entered on was as persistently pursued. The ecclesiastical revenues and the sacred buildings themselves were early marked out for spoliation. In a paper, dated 15 February 1547 are seen “the names of those to be raised to dignity, and lands to be given to them”. Amongst these are the following: “My lord of Hertford “with his dukedom” £ 800 lands a year, and £ 200 of the next bishop’s lands”².

Sir Thomas Darcy was to be made steward of the bishop of Norwich in Suffolk and Sir Richard Southwell in Norfolk. My lord Wentworth was “to have the stewardship of all my lord of Ely, his lands and master of his game in Norfolk, in Suffolk and in Cambridgeshire”: Sir William Petre was granted “the £ 100 a year of my lord of Winchester” (bishop Gardiner) whilst “the stewardship of all my lord of Lincoln’s lands” with other small perquisites was divided between Sir William Goring and Sir Ralph Vane. It is a mere common place of history how faithfully and generously the policy thus modestly initiated was pursued to the end.

But the rulers were not content to lay down only the main lines of conduct in greater matters. The attack began at once and in detail upon almost every point of the ancient system. In 1547, Ash Wednesday

¹ Tytler, I p. 25.

² State Papers. Domestic. Vol. I No. 11. This appears to be a draft corrected by Hertford himself: the words “and £ 200 &c” have been added by the corrector.

fell upon 23 February, and the Lent sermons afforded an excellent opportunity for the preachers of the new era. It must be borne in mind that in those days there was no "liberty of prophecyng". Henry had opened and shut the mouths of the preachers throughout the country at will, and they might preach unacceptable doctrine at their peril. The pulpit was consequently at this time essentially and purely an official organ of the state and its utterances are to be accepted as indications of the will of the government.

The man selected to preach before the court on Ash Wednesday was Nicholas Ridley, who in September of the same year was made bishop of Rochester. In it he gave a specimen of the acceptable word and struck the note which it would be safe for other preachers to take up. After admonishing his audience that he would specially travail in the confutation "of the Bishop of Rome's pretended authority" — a subject which it might be thought was by this time somewhat out of date — he proceeded to matters of more immediate interest and dealt with images and ceremonies. All images, whether of our Lord or the saints he styled *idols*. In the matter of ceremonies he particularly selected "holy water to drive away devils" for condemnation. The text of the sermon is lost, but it is not difficult to conjecture the manner in which Ridley developed his theme.

Besides these minor matters he touched on a principle of the greatest practical importance. Although speaking of the invisible church of the elect — "an unknown church to us and known only to God", yet he declared "the union of that church in the permixed church, which God ordereth man to complain unto and to hear again". At this point he becomes clear: "men" he says "must receive the

determination of the practical church and obey where God's law repugneth not expressly".¹

About this same time Barlow, bishop of St. David's preached a sermon seemingly advocating religious changes generally, to which also Gardiner directed the Protector's attention. In his letter the bishop so clearly expressed the ideas of religious policy to which during the whole reign he was faithful that a few passages from it deserve quotation.

"Alas! my lord, this is a piteous case" he writes, "that, having so much business as ye have, these inward disorders should be added unto them... being now a time rather to repair that which needeth reparation, than to make any new buildings, which they pretend. Quiet, tranquility, unity and concord shall maintain estimation. The contrary may animate the enemy to attempt that which was never thought on, which God forbid. There was never attempt of alteration made in England but upon comfort of discord at home; and woe be to them that mind it. If my lord of St. David's, or such others, have their heads cumbered with any new platform, I would wish they were commanded, between this and the king's majesty's full age, to draw the plat, diligently to hew the stones, dig the sand and chop the chalk, in the unseasonable time of building. And, when the King's Majesty cometh to full age to present their labours to him; and in the mean time, not to disturb the state of the realm, whereof your Grace is protector; but that you may, in every part of religion, laws, lands and decrees (which four contain

¹ See Bp. Gardiner's letter to Ridley cautiously enclosed in one to Somerset for his information. The date of the latter is February 28. Foxe, VI. pp. 58-9.

the state) deliver the same unto our sovereign lord according unto the trust you be put in, which shall be much to your honour and as all honest men wish and desire".¹

The fast of Lent had long been rigidly observed by the english people and they were at this time scandalized also by attacks on the practice. Odet de Selve, the french ambassador, writing to his government on 24 April (1547) from London, says: — "I am told that a preacher who had spoken this past Lent against those who eat flesh, and did not observe the said Lent according to the commandments of the Church, has today publicly retracted in the great church of St. Paul, which is the cathedral church of this city, and has preached just the contrary to the people, remitting the observance of the said Lent and other days to the discretion and conscience of each individual: and this by the commandment, as he said, of the king of England and his Council".²

"The same month of April" writes Stowe "Dr. Glasier preached at Paul's cross and affirmed there that the Lent was not ordained of God to be fasted, neither the eating of flesh to be foreborne; but that the same was a politic ordinance of men and might therefore be broken by men at their pleasure".³ This sermon was different from the retraction mentioned by de Selve and was probably preached at Paul's cross to emphasize the lesson and the doctrine.⁴

Submissions and recantations appear then to have

¹ Foxe (ed. Townsend) vi. p. 25.

² *Inventaire analytique des archives : Correspondance Politique d'Odet de Selve* (1546—1549). Paris 1888 p. 134.

³ Stowe. *Flores* p. 1001.

⁴ Cf. Heylyn, *Hist. of the Reform*: I. 39.

been the order of the day. Dr. Smith, a prominent theologian, who had dedicated his work: "a defence of the sacrifice of the mass" to king Henry VIII not long before the king's death, now "recanted at Paul's cross on Sunday, 15 May, declaring his former books and teaching to be erroneous and heretical".¹ On this matter the french ambassador gives further information. Writing from London on 23 May to his king he says: "I may tell you, Sire, that in these last few days a preacher, as I am told, has retracted in the great church here the things he had formerly preached according to the tradition of the Church, and has spoken in the most irreverent way of the sacraments and the saints and with the utmost license that is possible of Lent and of all ecclesiastical regulations. This sermon has been printed here in english, and it is sold publicly in this city to the lords of this court. Of the Protector, Sire, many people think he not only favours such things; but that he introduces them. One thing, Sire, I can assure you to be true: that in a building he is raising in this town they stop work neither Sundays nor feastdays; and indeed they worked on it even upon last Ascension day".²

In the same way upon 19 June, another public retractation was ordered. "Perryn, who had preached that it was good to have worshipped the pictures of Christ and his saints, now said that he had been deceived and was very sorry that he had taught such doctrine." But already the tide had turned. At this time the government could do no more than feel their way. Before the end of May the french ambassador writes that "there are rumours about the

¹ Stowé *ut supra*.

² *Inventaire analytique &c.* p. 145.

city of some rising of the people again in Ireland, and some speak of popular murmurs in this kingdom (England), in the northern parts, on account of the novelties which are attempted every day by these new governors against the ancient approved religion".¹

The Irish troubles and a Scotch war now in prospect counselled moderation and inspired a desire "to allay these inward disorders", of which Bishop Gardiner had given warning to Somerset. Odet de Selve writes on 16 June: "It seems that the people are growing more cold here and repent the innovations which had been begun in matters of religion, some proclamation² having been issued not to speak or preach about them otherwise than was done in the lifetime of the late king of England. And some former sermons have, I hear, been recalled in which evil was spoken of the sacraments, of the saints and of Lent".³

Moreover, if Cardinal Pole's information can be trusted, some stay had been put upon the proceedings of Somerset and Cranmer by the Emperor as early as the March of this year (1547). Writing from Rome on 6 April to the Emperor's confessor he says, "that he had heard that Charles had received the English ambassadors with weighty reproof on account of the innovations in religion and certain impious decrees adopted by the Council". And in conveying his thanks

¹ Ibid.

² This would appear to be the proclamation referred to by Bp. Gardiner who on 27 May had made representations to Somerset against the sermons then common in the country. On 6 June, he writes: "Having first read your Grace's most gentle letters, signifying the device of a proclamation to stay these rumours", and "reading the same proclamation which your servant brought unto me". (Foxe ed. Townsend VI. p. 36)

³ *Inventaire* &c p. 152.

he says, "this expostulation seems to have brought this advantage to religion, that those who were the authors of that impious decree against the sacrament of the altar have not promulgated it".¹ It is hardly probable that on such a subject Pole was ill informed.

But, however those who now managed english affairs might draw back for the moment, the object to be attained was always kept in view. The methods only were changed for others somewhat less irritant; and it had already been arranged that these were to be carried out by agents more entirely under the control of their masters. The expedient adopted was a royal visitation, which had proved so successful in Henry's reign in carrying forward the royal resolves. It had the advantage also of bringing home to the clergy throughout the whole kingdom their entire dependence on the royal authority and giving them a sense of their complete helplessness to resist the royal measures.

The commissioners, partly ecclesiastics and partly laymen, were appointed under the great seal by the king as Supreme Head of the Church. They were furnished with certain articles of enquiry and fortified with certain "godly injunctions"² drawn up "by the advice of sundry bishops and others the best learned men of the realm" as the Council say³ "and ministered by the king to his loving subjects. All which injunctions his Highness willetth and comandeth his loving subjects by his supreme authority obediently to receive and truly to observe and keep, every man in their offices, degrees and states, as

¹ Quirini IV. 44. Quoted in Tierney's "Dodd" II. LX—LXI.

² Wilkins IV. 3.

³ In a letter of 30 June 1547. Council Book (Council office) I. p. 357.

they will avoid his displeasure and the pains in the same hereafter expressed."

In these injunctions are mingled in curious juxtaposition reasonable and salutary provisions and undoubted novelties. The real object of the whole is tersely expressed by Edward himself in his journal:—"Certain injunctions" he writes "were set forth which took away divers ceremonies, and commissioners sent to take down images, and certain homilies were set forth to be read in the church".¹

The following changes thus inaugurated by the king's authority only require mention here: No lights were in future to be burnt before any image.² The epistle and gospel at the high mass were to be read to the people in english in the pulpit or other convenient place. Every sunday and holiday one chapter of the new Testament in english was to be read at matins immediately after the lessons, and one chapter of the old Testament at even-song after the Magnificat. "When nine lessons are to be read in the church, three of them" were to be omitted with their responsories; and at even-song the responses with all the commemorations were to be left out.³

¹ Burnet II. 2. p. 4.

² This was a matter upon which Cranmer had shown himself solicitous in Henry's reign.

³ These last were short antiphons and prayers at the end of the office, commemorating the Blessed Virgin, the Holy Cross &c. or for Peace. In the document the word is "*memories*" which puzzled Heylyn who thought it must mean obits. Cranmer spoke of them in the convocation of 1543, and got rid of them in his own scheme for a breviary. In his visitation of the diocese of Canterbury in 1548, the archbishop asks "whether they have omitted.... at even-song the responds with all the memories." (*Remains*. Parker Soc. p. 156.)

Henceforth no procession was to be allowed in any church or churchyard or other place; but immediately before the high mass the clergy were by the injunctions ordered to kneel in the midst of the church and sing or say the litany which had been set forth in english.

It may be useful to call attention to the full import and effect of this last provision. The litany, it is true, had generally a processional character; ¹ but the processions before the high mass ² had nothing whatever to do with the litany. They were composed of anthems and versicles which varied according to the sunday or festival, and they formed the chief part, if not the entire contents, of a special book called the *Processional*. The inspiration of this provision came probably from Cranmer himself, for by this simple injunction one liturgical book was without difficulty got rid of altogether. It also effected a break with all previous liturgical tradition in regard to the litany; and a blow was struck at ceremonies, of which, in the ancient rite, processions had formed one of the most imposing features.

Beyond this all were enjoined to make no alteration in the order of "Common Prayer" ³ or Divine Service,

¹ Among Catholics this fact is now somewhat obscured by the common use of the litany of the B. Virgin and the Saints at the devotions known as the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and the *Quarantore*. Of course these were unknown at this time.

² John Aubrey thus recalls the processions before mass and those of rogation days: "The solemnities of procession in and about the church, and the perambulations in the fields besides their convenience were fine diversions. The priests went before in their formalities singing the latin service and the people came after making their good-meaning responses" (ed. *Wilts Archæol. Soc.* p. 11.)

³ This word since so familiar was then a novelty.

otherwise than was specified in the injunctions "until such time as the same shall be otherwise ordered by the king's authority". And, as if anticipating the reception which would be given by the people to these novelties, the injunctions provide that "in the time of the litany, of the mass, of the sermon and whenever the priest readeth the scriptures to his parishioners no manner of persons without a just and urgent cause shall depart out of the church, and all ringing and knolling of bells shall be utterly foreborne at that time except one bell to be rung or knolled before the sermon".

A special series of royal injunctions was addressed this year (1547) "to the deans, subdeans, prebendaries, chanters &c. &c. in every cathedral church of the realm". Of these the most interesting were the abolition of matins in the night time and the requirement that all should attend the sermons preached in their church, in consideration of which they were dispensed from saying Prime and the "Hours".

"Item", runs the first, "to the intent that there may be one uniform order in keeping of divine service within all cathedral churches and colleges of this realm, and for the avoiding of riot and divers inconveniences, which have happened by the ministers of such churches wherein they were wont to rise at midnight to matins, the king's Majesty willeth and commandeth that the dean and all the prebendaries and other ministers of those churches shall surcease from singing of the divine service in the night time; and that the dean and prebendaries and all ministers of the same churches, from the last day of the present month, evermore begin matins at six of the clock in the morning".

The second runs: "Item they shall be present at all sermons preached within their church and cease

from all other divine service during the time of the same. And, that they may the more conveniently attend upon the said sermon all such days as they have any sermon, they shall omit the Prime and Hours".¹

The special injunctions given to the dean and chapter of Canterbury and dated 22 September 1547, afford some variations. Thus: "Item" the document says "in consideration of the sermon or else the homily to be made on the holy days, no Lady mass on those days shall be sung in the choir".

"Item all sequences to be omitted and hereafter no more to be sung in the choir neither working day nor holy day".

... "Item that henceforth all masses by note shall be sung within the choir at such times as heretofore they have been used to be sung in other places of the church".

"Item that at the sermon time one or two bell-ringers shall be appointed by course to keep the chapter house door, to the intent that the noise of the people disturb not the preacher or the hearers of the word of God".

"Item two chapters of the Bible to be read in the

¹ Corpus Christi Coll: Cambridge MS. 120. ff. 66d, 63d.

One or two points in these injunctions may be noted. "Item they shall every day have some part of Holy Scripture read in english at their table in the time of their meals" (f. 65). "Item they shall lay in the choir two bibles of the largest volume in english for the ministers to use, and two other of the like sort in the body of the church" (Ibid). The special injunctions for Lincoln which have been preserved (C. C. C. MS. 108 ff. 265—9) run in the same general form, but against the provision as to midnight matins is the note *vacat*, from which it may be gathered that in this church matins had already been transferred to a later hour in the morning.

choir one in the morning immediately after matins and another in the evening after (the) Magnificat; to be read by the petty canons, the eldest of them to begin and so by course unto the last of them".

"Item the choristers to have from henceforth the crown shaven no more; their heads nevertheless to be kept short" ¹.

The aim of these various provisions is clear. They were intended to bring the sermon into chief prominence at the expense of the prayers and psalmody. This is quite in the spirit of the 'canon' for shortening the public prayers in favour of preaching, contained in Cranmer's MS. project of morning and evening service. They secured also by the restriction of sung masses to the choir that all such service should have a congregational character.

One of the first results of this visitation was to bring Gardiner and Bonner to the Fleet prison. The latter on 12 August was convented before the Council, to which Sir Anthony Cooke, one of the royal visitors in the diocese of London, had reported the bishop's protest against the injunctions. At the Council Bonner agreed to withdraw his protest; but as a warning to others he was kept in the Fleet for a week. ²

"The Bishop of Winchester" so runs the entry in the Council Book "having written to the lords of his Majesty's Council and besides that spoken to others impertinent things of the king's Majesty's visitation, and refused to receive the injunctions and

¹ Ibid. MS. 120. ff. 57, 61 and 61d. The last refers to the practice of tonsuring the choristers which was retained in french cathedrals up to the revolution.

² Council Bk. Harl. MS. 2308 f. 69. The protest and submission are given ff. 70—1.

homilies, because as he said, on being examined by their lordships thereupon, they contained things dissident with the Word of God, so as his conscience would not suffer him to accept them, was sent under the safe leading of Sir Anthony Wingfield to the Fleet".¹

Of the nature of his confinement there he himself writes to Somerset on 12 November, "these seven weeks saving one day I have been here under such straight keeping as I have spoken with no man." He adds, that he has been obliged to leave off study and give himself "to continual walks for exercise".²

From another letter written by the bishop from his prison on 14 October (1547) it is clear that his action was deliberate. He was determined by all means in his power to stay the course whereby those in power were hurrying on the innovations, and he was fully conscious that in so doing he was bringing himself into extreme danger.³

The court officials were giving meantime unmistakable proof that the supreme authority had determined upon radical changes in ancient ritual and observance. As early as 11 April (1547) the compline was sung in english in the royal chapel, and about the same time licence was granted to Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch to print "books concerning divine service.... being in the english or latin tongue".⁴ One prominent feature also of the visitation was the breaking down of the images, which under the injunctions was to extend to "pictures on the walls, glass windows and not merely in church but

¹ Ibid. f. 72. Sept. 25, 1547.

² Foxe. ed. Townsend VI. p. 54.

³ See his interesting letter printed in Foxe VI. p. 42.

⁴ Rot. Pat. 1 Ed. VI. Pars 4, m. 7. April 22 1547.

even in houses",¹ and as early as May of this year (1547) a mob had somewhat anticipated the work of the authorized wreckers. Considering that preaching would only irritate these people, Gardiner had written an earnest appeal to Somerset on the matter. The Protector however appears to have done nothing but send to the bishop a treatise on the right reverence due to images.

But the royal visitors had hardly got well to work, before the Catholic feeling of the people generally made itself felt, and the authorities were compelled to pause. Odet de Selve, writing from London on 27 September, after reporting that the bishop of Winchester had been sent to prison two days previously, continues: "However things may be tending, it is certain that this fury in knocking down images of late indulged in has cooled, and some even of the commissioners who had been charged with the work have been imprisoned. It has been imputed to them that they have exceeded their commissions and that they were only ordered to take away those images to which the people brought candles² and which

¹ Wilkins, IV. p. 7.

² The innovators in Edward's reign seem to have been unfortunate in what they rejected or retained, if what is commonly called the rule of antiquity be taken as the test. For instance, lights in divine service are first found in connection with these three points (1) the reading of the Gospel; (2) feasts of martyrs, which involved the honouring of their relics; (3) burial of the dead (see Mühlbauer, *Gesch. und Bedeutung der (Wachs-)Lichter bei kirchlichen Funktionen*, p. 9, 11, 17, 19, 101, 103). Lights on the altar are of late mediæval introduction, though the pictured representation of a single candle on the altar may be found in the twelfth and perhaps the eleventh century. The modern introduction of *gradins* is a witness to the scruple felt at placing anything on the altar beyond what was absolutely necessary for the sacrifice.

were abused, as these new theologians say, and nevertheless they pulled down all indifferently and with great derision. In regard to this, I believe that they had a very good and general commission and that what they did would not have been questioned (by their employers) unless opposition had been made to it; to meet which, I have a notion that they had reserved for themselves escape by this fine and subtle distinction between the saints to whom candles are offered and those to whom they are not. But I am sure that, if the Protector have a voice in chapter, all be very soon in one case (*livrée*). No other cause of the said bishop of Winchester's (imprisonment) is given, so far as I know, except that he has refused to write or subscribe his approval of this doing away with images and of such other fine and new reforms, as these people have just carried out" ¹.

By the imprisonment of bishop Gardiner the men in power got rid of one of the chief obstacles to the free and further development of the drama. The meeting of Parliament, which contrary to the usual practice on the accession of a king of England had been put off for many months, could not in decency be much longer delayed. It was summoned for November and actually met whilst the bishop was in safe keeping. The men who held the powers of government were right in fearing the influence which he might exercise in an assembly where he had been long a prominent member, and with those to whom he was so well known. They had reason to dread his power to get others to accept his cardinal principle of keeping quiet whilst the king was yet a child, enforced with the energy and conviction which he could employ so well, which could not

¹ *Inventaire analytique* &c. pp. 210—11.

fail to make a deep impression upon the minds of his hearers and might not improbably end in counterbalancing even their power.

All his life Gardiner had had to deal with men, and had influenced them not unsuccessfully. He had early learnt not to make it difficult for his opponents to retreat from any position. His practice and habit whilst things were in movement was to put the best construction possible on the words and deeds of others. Notwithstanding his roughness at times he showed himself possessed of a fund of *bonhomie*. He could gossip and liked to gossip, especially about his old master, Henry, for whom he entertained a real affection. At the same time, he was not a man who did not know what fear was. His was a stronger soul, for he had by practice taught himself to master fear in a rough school. Henry, to use his own expression, had often "squared" with him. But when Gardiner had thought himself in the right he did not hesitate to stand his ground, "for which" he says "the king loved me never the worse".¹ At a time, when it was already clear that everything ecclesiastical was being questioned, the words and counsels of a man so practised in state affairs and of such steadfastness, could hardly fail to be decisive among his peers.

It was this influence which those in power most feared, and Gardiner fully appreciated the motives which impelled them to keep him in prison. In a letter written to Somerset from the Fleet in the first days of November he says: "I cannot discuss by conjecture why evidence is put off in my case that hath been wont commonly to be granted to all men. If it should be of any man the policy to keep me from

¹ Gardiner to Somerset, Foxe VI. p. 36.

Parliament, it were good to be remembered whether mine absence from the upper house, with the absence of those I have used to name in the nether house, will not engender more case of objection, if opportunity serve hereafter, than my presence, with such as I should appoint".¹

The "opportunity" however was never allowed to come. Gardiner never during this reign took his seat again in the house of peers to meet those before whom objection could be taken; nor did Somerset and Cranmer rest until he was deposed from the see of Winchester and was safe within the walls of the Tower.

¹ Foxe VI. p. 53.

CHAPTER V.

THE PARLIAMENT AND CONVOCATION

1547.

Parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster on 4 November, 1547. The governing powers were not unmindful of the necessity for securing, as usual at this time, the return of members who would support their views, and the Council Book affords a glimpse of the methods employed to override the popular choice. In two instances the active interference of the Council with the liberty of election had been resented and it was considered best to draw back. Thus, the sheriff of Kent, in his desire to secure the return of Sir John Baker as knight of the shire, "did abuse towards those of the shire the (Council's) request into a commandment (and) as their lordships advertise him . . . they meant not, nor mean to deprive the shire by their commandment of their liberty of election. (But yet) if they, the people, would in satisfaction of their lordships' request grant their voices to Mr. Baker, they would take it thankfully".

At the same time "a like letter was written to the lord warden of the Cinque ports, with this addition: that being informed he should abuse their requests to menace them of the shire of Kent . . . so they

advised him to use things in such sort as the shire might have the free election".¹

The opening of the first parliament of the reign was made the occasion of a state pageant: "his Majesty riding from his palace of Westminster to the church of St. Peter in his parliament robes with all his lords spiritual and temporal riding in their robes also". This opportunity moreover was seized upon to introduce a novelty more significant than any yet attempted, for it touched the ritual of the mass itself. After a sermon, made by Dr. Ridley, the new bishop of Rochester "the mass began" writes Wriothesley. The "*Gloria in excelsis*, the Creed and the *Agnus* were all sung in english".² The prayers said by the priest, including of course the sacred Canon, were as formerly in latin, but the general effect which the service must have had upon those present is correctly given by the historian Stowe when he writes: "that same day mass was sung before the lords in the english tongue".³

This was undoubtedly the most important liturgical innovation yet attempted. There had been, it is true, essays in change which at the time must have been startling enough. The novel ritual of consecration and coronation before drawn up by the Council had manifested a disregard for time honoured ceremonies. As all matters affecting the divine service were expressly reserved to be "ordered and transposed by the King's authority",⁴ the royal chapel was the safe scene of any experiment; it may be presumed that all that was done there had his Majesty's countenance

¹ Council Bk. Harl. MS. 352 ff. 45d—46. Sept. 28, 1547.

² *Chronicle*. Camden Soc. I. p. 187.

³ *Flores Hist.* p. 1002.

⁴ Wilkins IV. p. 6.

and approval. And thus, as already noted, as early as Easter Monday of this year, the old evening service of compline had been sung before the king in english.

In the same way the order of thanksgiving for the victory of Pinkie may be considered official, and it was settled by official regulation. On 18 September, when the news of Somerset's victory over the Scots was received "order was given by letters (from the Council) sent to all the bishops of the realm to cause in the chief cities or towns of their dioceses a sermon to be preached and the *Te Deum* to be solemnly sung or said and the litany in english giving thanks to God for the victory".¹

Eye witnesses of the solemnity as it was kept in London describe it as a procession. What such a general procession had been hitherto and what it was again in Mary's reign is well known. In the present case the commands of the official injunctions as to processions issued a few months previously, appear to have caused some embarrassment. The french ambassador describes the London service in the somewhat contemptuous phrase of "a general procession according to the new mode of this country";² and this vague description is hardly made clearer by the words of Wriothesley, who probably saw what was done but was at a loss how to describe it. "The 20th (day of September) being St. Matthew's day" he writes "was a solemn sermon made at Paul's by the bishop of Lincoln, with procession kneeling with their copes in choir. And after that the *Te Deum* sung with the organs playing". The model set at Paul's was next day followed in all the London churches, which "kept a solemn procession on their knees in english".³

¹ Council Bk : Harl. MS. 352 f. 45.

² *Inventaire Analytique* p. 205.

³ *Chronicle*. Camd. Soc. I. 186.

The first business of the Commons was the election of the speaker of the house. "Sir John Baker, knight, chancellor of the fruits and tenths," about whose seat the Council had interested themselves, was chosen; and before the end of the month of November the house was engaged in considering a bill for handing over to the king's use the chantry and other church lands. This after some delay and difficulty passed through the house upon 22 December. The Lords were meantime occupied with matters more strictly ecclesiastical. On 15 November there was read, for the first time, a bill "for admission of bishops by the king's Majesty only", which the peers finally consented to on 3 December, and which passed the Commons also on the seventeenth of the same month. It was acted upon without delay, and its object was evident. On 1 December the jurisdiction of the bishops, which during the king's visitation had been suspended, was restored to them by an act of the Council "in as ample a way as they had it previously".¹ But what was given with one hand was in reality taken away with the other. The new act, now before parliament, "ordained that bishops should be made by the king's Majesty's letters patent and not by the election of deans and chapters; that all their processes and writings should be made in the King's name only, with the bishop's *teste* added to it, and sealed with no other seal but the king's, or such as should be authorized or appointed by him"; thus "making them no other than the king's ministers only, his ecclesiastical sheriffs, as a man might say, to execute his will and dispense his mandates".²

¹ MS. Council Bk. (Privy Council office) I p. 252.

² Heylyn, *Hist. of Reformation* p. 51.

It will be necessary to examine somewhat more closely the bills relating to the Sacrament introduced and passed at this time. Bent upon upsetting the existing ecclesiastical settlement, the Council had more than once, on experiencing opposition, drawn back from the very measures promoted by themselves. They had however evoked a restless spirit which it is always more easy to stir than to allay. In every community there are always many ready and even eager for change, and many circumstances combined to make this the case in England during the short years of Edward's reign. The motives of a few, although they would seem to have been but a very few, were at least respectable, sincere and honest. Their reforming tendencies had been kept down for some years by the strong hand of Henry; but now these men found freedom to speak and hoped for freedom to act. The bulk however of the innovators were but an unruly mob, for whom destruction and freedom from restraint have ever an attraction, and whose instinct is always against authority and tradition.

The Council itself by a proclamation issued on 12 November, just after the meeting of Parliament, bears witness to the disorders which its action had evoked. "For as much" the document runs "as the misorders by the serving men and other young and light persons and apprentices of London towards priests and those that go in scholars' gowns like priests, hath of late both in Westminster hall and other places of the city of London been so great that not only it hath offended many men, but also hath given great occasion (if on the parts of the said priests more wisdom and discretion had not been shown than on the other) of murder and sedition, or at least of such other inconveniences

as are not to be suffered in a commonwealth, as to the king's Highness and his most entirely beloved uncle, the Duke of Somerset.... and the rest of his Majesty's Council hath been credibly and certainly reported and shewed; for reformation whereof the king's Highness, by the advice of his most dear uncle and other his Majesty's Council, willeth and straightly commandeth, that no serving man, nor apprentice nor any other person whatsoever he or they be, shall use hereafter such insolency and evil demeanour towards priests, as reviling, tossing of them, taking violently their caps and tippets from them without just title and cause; nor otherwise use them than as becometh the king's most loving subjects one to do towards another".¹

But even whilst issuing this order to the people of London the Council gave contrary example in its acts. The resumption of the war against images which it had been found prudent to discontinue in September was permitted: "Item" says the writer of the Grey Friars' chronicle "the 17th day of the same month of November at night was pulled down the rood in Paul's with Mary and John, with all the images in the church. And two of the men that laboured at it were slain and divers other sore hurt".² Another contemporary, Wriothesley, expressly states that this was the work of "the king's Majesty's visitors" and adds "that the popish priests said the accident was the will of God for the pulling down of the said idols. Likewise all images in every parish church in London were pulled down and broken by the commandment of the said visitors".³

¹ Council Bk. Harl. MS 352, ff. 47d-48.

² ed. Camden Soc. p. 54.

³ *Chronicle*—Camd. Soc. II. p. 1.

Not content with example the Council added precept, and the pulpit comedies of Henry's days were renewed. For "the 27th day of November, being the first Sunday of Advent" writes Wriothlesley "preached at Paul's cross, Dr. Barlow, bishop of St. David's, where he showed a picture of the resurrection of our Lord, made with vices, which put his legs out of the sepulchre and blessed with his hand and turned his head; and there stood before the pulpit the image of our Lady which they of Paul's had lapped up in cere cloth, which was hid in a corner of Paul's church and found by the visitors in their visitation. And in his sermon he declared the great abomination of idolatry in images, with other feigned ceremonies contrary to scripture, to the extolling of God's glory and to the great comfort of the audience. After the sermon the boys broke the idols in pieces".¹

But the public insults and mockeries heaped upon holy things did not rest here. They were turned against the Blessed Sacrament, which the whole people throughout the land believed to be our Blessed Lord himself. It was nicknamed "Jack in the box, with divers other shameful names",² by which the public conscience was gravely shocked. To meet the popular feeling an act of parliament was proposed putting down such profanity under severe penalties. But Somerset, Cranmer and their friends knew how to turn even this into a means for advancing their own ends.

On 12 November a bill "for the Sacrament of the altar" was read for the first time in the house of peers. The second reading was taken on the 15th, and here for the moment the matter rested. This bill

¹ *Chronicle, ibid.*

² *Grey Friars' Chronicle*, p. 54.

may be called the Catholic half of the act subsequently passed. Its object was to put down the growing irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament. Towards the end of the same month of November, however, another measure appeared providing "for the administration of the Sacrament under both kinds," which was read for the first time on the 26th. On 3 December, the former bill for the reverence to the Sacrament was read a third time and in the same sitting committed to Somerset.

The case then stood as follows: the bill against irreverence to the Sacrament had been read three times; the bill for the new mode of communion once. The journals of the House give no record of the methods employed to bring about the actual result; but the act which finally passed was a combination of the two bills. The whole matter was evidently arranged by Somerset, to whom the former bill was committed, between Saturday, 3 December, and Monday the 5th. On this latter day a bill appears in the House of Lords, still under the harmless title of an act "for the Sacrament of the body and blood". It is again entered in the journals of the House, on the seventh, as a bill "for the most holy Sacrament of the altar" and on December the tenth was read the bill for the most Holy Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which passed by the common assent of all the peers except the bishops of London, Norwich, Hereford, Worcester and Chichester.

¹ The want of an exact record presents a considerable difficulty in this reign. The most weighty matters and measures are generally involved in an obscurity which can hardly have been unintentional. For the proceedings of Parliament nothing exists but the titles of bills, the dates of readings and sometimes a record of the final voting. Even this is embarrassed by the appearance of bills introduced, which disappear and reappear with changed titles.

The bill thus passed in the Lords is the act which now appears in the statute book combining, under one single act (1) the bill for reverence to the Sacrament and (2) the bill for communion in both kinds.

The episcopal vote given in favour of and against this measure deserves consideration. Eleven bishops were absent from Parliament on the occasion and seem to have appointed no proxies¹, and on looking at the list of absentees there does not seem to have been one amongst them who can fairly be classed among the advocates of change.

The votes of the five bishops recorded against the bill, are more weighty than a mere expression of opinion. These prelates, above the rest then in parliament, must have ardently desired to see as the law of the land that part of the amalgamated bill which professed to put down all irreverences against the Blessed Sacrament. Believing it to be what they did, it must have cost them much even to appear unwilling to defend it against scurrilous unbelief. Their objection consequently to the portion tacked on by Somerset and his friends, must have been deep indeed to overcome the natural instinct of a Catholic to welcome legal condemnation of the current blasphemies.

Ten bishops voted for the measure. Their intentions in so doing must be purely a matter of conjecture; but looking at after events it will not be far from the truth to divide them equally into two parties:

¹ These eleven were: Gardiner, detained in the Fleet; Vesey of Exeter; Sampson of Coventry and Lichfield; Kitchin of Llandaff; Knight of Bath; Thirlby of Westminster; Wakeman of Gloucester; Chambers of Peterbro'; Bird of Chester; Bulkeley of Bangor; and King of Oxford.

one following the lead of Cranmer, the other of Tunstall of Durham ¹.

The bill was read for the first time in the Commons on 10 December, the very day it had been passed in the Lords. Up to the last moment there is manifested on the part of the Government a disposition to tamper with it. "On December 17th" says the record in the journals of the Lords "a proviso was sent to the Commons house through Mr. Hales, to be attached to the bill for the most Holy Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the which the Commons would not receive because the Lords had not given their consent". ²

Of this bill passed in the commons on 17 December it is here sufficient to notice that the first portion condemned all, who "in their sermons, preachings, readings, lectures, communications, arguments, rhymes,

¹ Those led by Cranmer were probably the bishops of Ely, St. David's, Lincoln, and Rochester; those led by Tunstall were Salisbury, St. Asaph, Carlisle and Bristol.

² This entry is all that is known on the subject; but it is evident that the provision in question has nothing to do with the joining of the two bills, as the amalgamation was effected before the bill was sent down to the lower House on 10 December, and it was this bill which passed there on the seventeenth.

Perhaps some light may be thrown on the nature of the provision which at the last moment it was desired to attach to the bill, by the report of the generally well-informed french ambassador. "It was expected" he writes "that there would be some commotion in this parliament for the Sacrament of the altar, which it was wished to abolish: nevertheless it will remain for the present, as people think; although the Protector and the chief nobles do not *use* it any more at home among their families, where they act as badly as, or worse than, the sacramentarians in Germany." (de Selve p. 248. '*use*' i. e. they no longer had mass in their private chapels.)

songs or jests" should call the Blessed Sacrament "by such vile and unseemly words, as Christian ears do abhor to hear." The penalties for so doing were fines and imprisonment to be awarded by "the justices of peace at the quarter sessions".

The second branch of the statute, after declaring that the administration of holy communion under both kinds of bread and wine was conformable to primitive practice, enacted "that the said most blessed Sacrament shall be commonly delivered and ministered unto the people within the churches of England and Ireland and other the king's dominions, under both kinds of bread and wine, except necessity otherwise requires". This exception being only to hold in the case of dangerous and sudden sickness "when wine cannot be provided, nor the sick person pass comfortably into the other world without receiving the Sacrament." It is further ordered, that a day before the celebration of the communion the people should be exhorted to prepare themselves and the statute concludes that this enactment—"should not be interpreted to the condemning the usage of any Church out of his Majesty's dominions".¹

This act closed the effective ecclesiastical business of the session. Parliament was prorogued on 24 December, 1547.

It is now necessary to consider the action and proceedings of Convocation. It met at St. Paul's on Saturday, 5 November, the day after the assembling of Parliament. The lower house at once elected as prolocutor Doctor Taylor, dean of Lincoln, whose presentation to the archbishop and prelates of the upper house was fixed for Friday, 11 November. This introduction did not however take place till

¹ Collier *Eccl. Hist.* (ed. 1845). V pp. 219—20.

the following Friday, the 18th. It was only at the third session, on Tuesday, 22 November, that the assembly settled to business and presented four petitions to the upper house, only one of which is to the present purpose. They requested, as already noted, "that the labours of the bishops and others, who by command of Convocation had been engaged in examining, reforming and setting forth, (*et edendo*) the divine service, should be produced and should be submitted to the examination of this house".

Nothing apparently came of this request, and nothing is heard about it afterwards. In the fourth session held on 25 November no business is recorded. Up to this point the proceedings of the assembly are clear and regular, but from the next session to the close the acts suggest many difficulties. Thus, the fifth session held on 30 November, was for some reason or other "*anticipated*". The only business done was "that the prolocutor shewed and caused to be publicly read the form of a certain ordinance delivered to him, as he asserts, by the archbishop of Canterbury, for the taking of the body of our Lord under both kinds of bread and also of wine".

This document was then subscribed by the prolocutor and fifteen others out of the fifty-eight present at the session ¹. It must not be considered a ritual form but merely a declaration for signature offered

¹ The names of the subscribers were: Taylor, dean of Lincoln; Cranmer the primate's brother; May, dean of St. Paul's; Parry, one of the *procuratores cleri* of Sarum; Caurden, dean of Chichester; Redman, archdeacon of Taunton; Latimer; Wilke, one of the *procuratores cleri* of Ely; Boone, dean of Newark college, Leicester; Roland Taylor one of *proc. cleri* Lincoln; Littleton *proc. cler.* Hereford; Haynes, dean of Exeter; Merryck, *proc. cler.* of St. David's; Benson, dean of Westminster; Sandford, *proc. cler.* Westminster; William Haynes, deputy for the archdeacon of Oxon.

to such members of Convocation as were present at this anticipated meeting. There is nothing whatever to show that the paper was "sent down from the bishops" as Burnet has it ¹; or "that it had been promoted among the bishops of the upper House" as more modern writers have asserted. The acts of the Convocation are singularly guarded as to the origin of the document. All that the official record can state about the matter is that "it was given to him" (the prolocutor) as he asserts "by the archbishop"². At the next meeting held on 2 December sixty-two members were present³. In this session "all the before named (i. e. all present) approved by word of mouth the proposal made in the last session about the taking of the body of our Lord under both kinds, *nullo reclamante*". At this meeting even the document itself is not mentioned in the act and there is no further question of subscription.

To form a just estimate of the real character of this proceeding it is necessary to compare what was done in the only other matter of business dealt with in this Convocation. At the eighth and last meeting, on 17 December, a proposal to abrogate all canons against the marriage of priests was introduced and considered. On this occasion the voting was by subscription, as appears not merely from the report in the acts of Convocation, but also from the original paper, which is still extant.⁴ Not

¹ Hist. II. 1. p. 50.

² "formam ejusdam ordinationis sibi ut asserit a Rev^{mo} Cant. traditam &c".

³ Of these 10 had not been present on Nov. 30 whilst 6, including one subscriber William Haynes then present, were now absent.

⁴ This paper now forms ff. 398—9 of the C.C.C.C. MS. 114. It bears the signatures of the *affirmantes* on the one side and the

merely so; but even on the question of the petitions to be presented to the archbishop, mooted in the third session, this same method of subscription was adopted for ascertaining the sense of the house. It may therefore be taken that this was the normal and regular method. Why another plan was finally adopted in regard to the proposal for communion in both kinds must be a matter for conjecture.

As already stated the bill for receiving the Sacrament was read for the first time in Parliament on 26 November,¹ four days before the matter had

negantes on the other. John Worthiall signed the *negative* but against his signature are the words: "*hic recantavit*". He does not sign the paper again among the majority, but, with the two proxies held by him, is counted among the *affirmantes*. "Robt. Steward" the last prior and first dean of Ely, signs himself among the *negantes* "*Decanus Elien. monachus*".

It has been often asserted on the strength of a declaration by John Redman on the subject, that he was absent from this meeting and sent his opinion in writing. The original paper shows that this was not the case for a short way down the paper of subscriptions to assent to change appears in a firm square hand "I John Redman think that a layman who hath but one wife or hath had but one wife being a mind to". At this point he was suddenly stopped, and what he had written was struck out; but he was not to be baulked. His name does not occur among the subscribers; but on a separate paper (f. 400) he gives his opinion in full. That his obstinacy was displeasing to authority is clear from the fact that in the Convocation acts his vote is not counted in the division. It may be as well to add that of the members of Convocation numbering over a hundred only 45 were actually present at this division; of whom including Worthiall 31 subscribed for the proposal and 14 against it. Including proxies the votes were 53 against 22.

¹ Burnet says (p. 41) that the bill for the Communion was brought in to the Lords on 24 Nov. This does not appear from the Journals.

been mooted in the Convocation of clergy. In view of the anticipation of a session in which such important business was to be transacted it looks as if the proposal for communion under both kinds was sprung upon Convocation. The attempt to obtain the subscription of the majority failed. It was found that the House could not be trusted to deal with the matter in the ordinary way and the expedient of obtaining some verbal approval was resorted to.

It is difficult not to bring this proceeding into connection with what was taking place in Parliament. What was required was, not the mature decision of the clergy, but some expression of opinion which might meet the parliamentary exigences of the government. As already pointed out the manipulation of the two bills, for the reverence of the Sacrament and for communion under both kinds, took place immediately afterwards.

Before leaving these proceedings of Convocation, it is necessary to call attention to the conditions under which the assembly of clergy were required to transact their duties. Since the changes under Henry VIII. "every Convocation in itself", writes Fuller, "is born deaf and dumb, so that it can neither hear complaints in religion nor speak in the redress thereof till first *ephatha* 'be thou opened' be pronounced upon it by commission from royal authority" ¹. Among the first acts of the Convocation of 1547 was consequently an address to the archbishop "to procure licence in writing to treat and commune" of matters touching religion "and therein freely to give their consents which otherwise they may not do upon pain of peril promised". They also desire

¹ *Church Hist.* ed. Brewer IV p. 109.

permission "quietly and in good order to reason and dispute among them in this house such matters as concern religion which be disputable".

How far they were satisfied in this regard may be gathered by an act of the penultimate session (9 December). On that day "were appointed Mr. dean of Winchester and Mr. Dr. Draycott to associate Mr. Prolocutor to my Lord of Canterbury to know a determinate answer... what indemnities and immunity this house shall have to treat of matters of religion in cases forbidden by the statutes of this realm to treat in".²

No reply to this demand is recorded, but it is clear the request made by the clergy when they first met had not up to this time been complied with, and that they were really not free to discuss "and freely to give their consents" even in matters most nearly touching religion. They met only once more after 9 December; namely on 17 December, and there can be little doubt that the words, which Fuller uses of a later Convocation of this reign, apply with equal and even greater force to their first meeting. "Now the true reason" he says "why the king would not entrust the diffusive body of the Convocation with the power to deal with matters of religion was a just jealousy which he had of the ill affection of the major part thereof, who under the fair rind of Protestant profession had the rotten core of Romish superstition".³

In carrying the act for communion Cranmer and Somerset had gained for the object they had at heart more than the mere provisions of the act gave

¹ Wilkins IV. p. 17.

² Acts. ut supra. For a note upon these acts see Appendix VII.

³ *Hist*: ed. Brewer IV 109.

them. As regards the fact of communion under both kinds, there were Catholics both in England and abroad who at this time were disposed for the sake of peace to concession. It was after all only a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, although some innovators in urging the incompleteness of the Sacrament, when administered under one kind only, gave a doctrinal turn to the question which issued in heresy. The great advantage secured to the innovators by the adoption of communion under both kinds in England was the opportunity it afforded them of effecting a break with the ancient missal. The change could, it is true, have been made, had those who had the management of affairs so willed, by the insertion of a few lines of rubric. But the passing of the act gave Cranmer a free hand, for, whilst it imposed the practice, it left the power of prescribing the mode to the government. This afforded the archbishop the opportunity of tampering with the ritual of the mass. The only limit to his action was his own moderation or the opposition he might encounter in carrying out his designs.

Before considering what was actually done attention must be directed to an attitude of mind which, however hard now to realize, was then a potent factor in determining men's conduct. Apart from the idea of the king as "supreme lord", even in matters of religion, the law, as the expression of the will of the nation consecrated by royal sanction, seemed to men like Gardiner and Tunstall to have a claim not merely on outward obedience but even on conscience. In such men it would be an entire mistake to attribute compliance to the mere fear of the consequences of disobedience. However overstrained and unreasonable an attitude of mind such as this may appear now, it was then a fact and must be reckoned with.

It is not intended to excuse or to blame those who thus acted; but merely to explain actions which unless this be borne in mind must be wholly unintelligible.

The case may perhaps be better understood by one or two examples. The story of the deposition of Heath, bishop of Worcester, as will appear subsequently, turns entirely upon this scruple. Though ready to face imprisonment and incur deprivation rather than assent to the new ordinal he declared that if it were imposed he would not "disobey". The princess Mary affords another example of this inconsequent attitude of mind. Writing to the king she affirms that nothing shall make her swerve from the dictates of conscience. After a series of letters to the Council in answer to their messengers, Wingfield and Petre, she protests that "rather than she will agree to use any other service than was used at the death of the late king her father, she would lay her head on a block and suffer death but", she said, "I am unworthy to suffer death in so good a quarrel. When the king's Majesty shall come to such years that he may be able to judge these things himself, his Majesty shall find me ready to obey his orders in religion".¹

Such ideas were closely connected with a sentiment of which it is now equally difficult to realize the religious and the patriotic aspects. Men have now been long accustomed to the idea of a people divided in religion. In Edward's days such disunion must have appeared to all fatal to the unity of a nation, which till then had been one in faith and practice. The well known phrase *cujus regio ejus religio* rests upon this basis in England, although in Germany it may have been applied to effect disintegration. It never

¹ Council Book printed in *Archæologia* XVII p. 163.

entered into the calculations of those who initiated the changes in England that the new system was to embrace anything less than the whole people. This fact must be borne in mind in considering the measures of religious repression commenced under Edward and adopted by Mary and Elizabeth. Long before the reign of the latter closed, it had become clear to all that the religious unity of England was shattered beyond the power of penal laws to repair. Yet even then the ideal was so powerful that it formed the basis of the ecclesiastical system conceived by Hooker, the first and perhaps the greatest of Anglican theologians.

In Edward's reign the outcome of such principles was to induce those who held a public position to put the best interpretation possible upon every measure, however much they may have resisted its imposition and disliked its object.

It remains now to consider the measures taken to give effect to the new law of communion under both kinds.

CHAPTER VI.

THE COMMUNION BOOK.

One great difficulty attending any enquiry into the ecclesiastical measures of this or the preceding reign lies in the presence of a number of dateless documents of primary importance. To assign a wrong date to these is often to invert the true sequence of events and thus misinterpret the story. And yet to ascertain even an approximate date is often a delicate and difficult matter.

Before speaking of the Communion Book, which was the practical outcome of the parliamentary action as to communion under both kinds, one such undated document must be carefully considered. This is a series of questions relating to the mass, which were submitted to the bishops and to two divines, with the answers returned to them. Various conjectural dates have been assigned to this paper ranging over a considerable period.¹

¹ Cf. Canon Dixon's *History of the Church*. II. 476, *note*.

This writer would assign the chief part of the document to some period before the meeting of parliament in 1547, since one of the questions proposed is: "whether it be convenient that masses satisfactory should continue, that is to say priests hired to sing for souls departed". Now "it would have been superfluous" he argues "to have asked this after the session of 1547, which destroyed chantries". This however is a misapprehen-

The questions were submitted to the great majority of the bishops of both provinces. Seventeen out of twenty seven return answers; but whether the rest, including Gardiner, who was in prison until 7 January 1548, were asked for their opinions does not appear.¹

On examination, the questions will be found to fall into three categories: The third and fourth questions may be summed up thus: 'What do you *mean* by the mass'?. The first, second and fifth ask: 'What is the mass *for*: for Sacrifice or Communion'?. The sixth and seventh raise the practical question: "Shall we do away with the mass, *offered* for the living and dead, as distinct from communion"? The two concluding questions relate to subordinate matters: the one (No. 8) asks whether the Gospel should be explained

sion. All that the act for chantries did was to abolish certain perpetual foundations for masses for the dead and give the revenues to the King. There is nothing in the act forbidding that priests be "hired to sing for souls departed". This could be done as well after the passing of the act as before, and was only made unlawful when the mass was abolished altogether. The case is accurately stated by Gardiner in the following passage from his sermon preached before the king and Council on June 29, 1548: "And if ye ask concerning the masses that were wont to be said in monasteries that if the masses had been good the monasteries had not been put down, to that I say, that when the number of the monasteries went away there was no prejudice to the mass, no more think I now that the chantries be gone. Though the chantries be transposed to another use yet the mass is not condemned. And the act of parliament was, nor is, not prejudicial to the ministers that they should have their living out of the same" (C. C. C. C. MS. 127 p. 21).

¹ The names of the bishops sending in their replies were: Canterbury, York, Durham, London, Hereford, Worcester, Chichester, Norwich, St. Asaph, Salisbury, Lincoln, Ely, Coventry and Lichfield, Carlisle, Rochester, Bristol and St. David's.

at the mass to the people; and the other (No. 9) whether the mass should be in english.¹

It is quite clear from the practical questions that the document must be assigned to some period in the first or second year of Edward's reign (1547 or 1548). The absence of any enquiry, in the whole series of questions, as to the desirability of communion under both kinds, shews that this question had already been removed from practical politics. As the matter was to be raised in the first parliament of 1547 and was finally decided on 20 December of that year, it can hardly be supposed that in a series of questions put expressly with a view to liturgical innovation, this one, which was the most pressing of all, would have been omitted. The date of the document may therefore be assigned with some assurance of certainty to a period after 20 December 1547.

The question as to date then resolves itself into an enquiry as to the precise period in 1548, which best suits the character of the document. The first four of the questions are answered by the bishop of St. David's. That see was vacant in 1548 from 3 February, the date of Barlow's translation to the diocese

¹ The original draft of the questions in Cranmer's hand is in C. C. C. C. MS. 105. ff. 230—1. The draft comprises questions 4 to 9 of the print (Burnet II. 2. pp. 138—147). Question 4. was first begun by Cranmer: "Whether it be convenient the accustomed —" This was struck out, and "What is the mass" put in its place. This he again changed into "Wherein consisteth the mass by Christ's Institution" as it stands in the print.

The draft also comprises the special questions afterwards addressed to the bishops of Worcester, Hereford and Chichester (See p. 87, *post*) printed in Burnet (ut sup. pp. 148—9). The original in Cranmer's hand of the first question has the expression "Sacrament of the altar" in place of "Sacrament of Thanks" as in the print from the Lambeth manuscript.

of Bath and Wells, to 7 September, when Ferrar was consecrated. The questions are evidently intended to be an attack on the mass; but by September 1548 things had gone so far that tentative and captious questions of this kind would have been out of date. The strong probability therefore is that these enquiries were addressed to the bishops before Barlow's translation from St. David's, or some time in the month of January 1548.¹

It has been stated that the questions were tentative. Their object apparently was to sound the bishops and see how far the innovators might safely go; and in particular, to find out whether it would be now possible to sweep away the mass altogether or whether it would be prudent to temporize yet awhile.

The answers given by the bishops are of great importance and interest. They show the attitude of mind of each individual prelate towards the traditional system, and throw much light on the later sequence of events. It is therefore necessary to dwell upon them at some length.

As might be expected Cranmer and Ridley took the extreme line of innovation in everything. In this they were generally followed, although not in all details by Holbeach of Lincoln and Barlow of St. David's with doctors Cox and Taylor. Goodrich of Ely stands alone. He takes the *via media*, discreetly leaving the settlement to the will of those in

¹ This seems to accord with a passage of the third series of questions (see p. 88 note) which has been pointed out by a reviewer: "Why may we not as well alter the mass into the english tongue, or alter the ceremonies of the same as we alter the Communion to be under both kinds." It may be well to recall that the questions do not seem to have been put to bishop Gardiner, who was released from prison on 7 January, 1548.

power, but not so far leaving the ancient lines as to make retractation, and the retention of his see in Mary's reign, any very difficult matter.

The rest of the bishops take the Catholic view in their replies to all the questions submitted. Six of them answer jointly throughout. The first of these, Bonner of London was a practical man but evidently no theologian. The unanimity of Skip of Hereford, Day of Chichester and Heath of Worcester is noteworthy in view of the subsequent history. A fifth of the number, Rugg of Norwich, although less known, took a prominent part, as will be seen, in the discussions which preceded the introduction of the bill for Common Prayer in the house of lords. The sixth was Wharton of St. Asaph.

The replies of Cranmer were throughout laconic and fitted to the terms of the questions. His mind as to his answers was probably made up when framing them. Taking the questions as summarized above, the answer of the archbishop to the interrogatory as to the nature of the mass is, that the "oblation and sacrifice" of Christ in the mass are terms improperly used, and that it is only a "memory and representation" of the sacrifice of the cross. In other words, Cranmer and the four bishops who went with him rejected the sacrifice of the mass, as it had hitherto been received in England and elsewhere.

The point of questions 1, 2 and 5, taken together, was to elicit opinions as to whether, apart from communion, the mass had any virtue in itself, or whether its sole virtue for the individual was in his own act of communion. Cranmer and the rest of the innovating party answered by saying, that the virtue of the sacrament did not extend beyond the reception. This struck at the mass as a sacrifice propitiatory for the living. Ridley, however, did not go quite

so far as the archbishop in this matter and called attention to the "spiritual participation amongst all the members of Christ in all godliness". In so far he approximated to the Catholic idea; although rejecting Catholic doctrine.

In replying to the practical questions (Nos. 6 and 7) as to whether the mass offered for the living and dead, apart from communion, should still be allowed to continue, Cranmer and Ridley are again of one mind and explicitly in favour of innovation. Holbeach and Dr. Cox, although inclining to these same views, do not distinctly commit themselves to radical change; whilst Dr. Taylor makes no reply to the questions.

On the other hand, the rest of the bishops, though their answers vary in form, are throughout unmistakably Catholic in their doctrine. But Sampson of Coventry and Lichfield is as remarkable for his intellectual confusion, as Aldrich of Carlisle is for his fullness and precision, and Tunstall of Durham for his masterly terseness and accuracy. ¹

In the case of three of the bishops, Cranmer was not content with the test to which they had been already put. To Heath of Worcester, Day of Chichester and Skip of Hereford, three of the group, already mentioned as replying jointly, a further set of seven interrogatories was administered. The selection of these bishops was possibly dictated by the hope that they might be coerced into joining the party of innovators. It is certain that the questions now put to them are couched in a tone of hectoring contempt. ² If such had been the expectation of

¹ Some of the bishops on the Catholic side do not answer all the questions.

² Thus questions (1) and (2) are as follows. "What or wherein *John's* fasting, giving alms, being baptized or receiving the

Cranmer and his friends they were disappointed. The three bishops reaffirmed their position yet more definitely and the religious temper evinced in the replies brings out only the more strongly the insolence of the questions.

The ninth of the general series of interrogatories: "Whether in the mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand?" was a practical matter of the first importance. It elicited replies from only fourteen of the bishops. Holgate of York is the only one who answers in the simple affirmative; whilst Aldrich of Carlisle merely expresses his readiness to submit his will to his "superiors and betters" and his "understanding to their judgments".

Cranmer here gives a single example of conservatism: "I think it convenient" he says "to have the vulgar tongue in the mass, except in certain mysteries, whereof I doubt." Ridley agrees with Holgate; but thinks that what "pertaineth to the consecration should be spoken in silence".¹

On this point of departure from tradition the Catholic instinct of many of the bishops again asserts itself. They were averse to breaking with the practice of Catholic christendom. "It is convenient", says Tunstall, "that the common latin tongue to these western parts of christendom be used in the mass being the common prayer of the whole church".

Sacrament of Thanks in *England*, doth profit and avail *Thomas dwelling in Italy* and not knowing what *John in England* doth". "What the said acts in John do profit them that be in heaven, and wherein"? It seems to have been in contemplation to subject them to a third interrogatory in the same spirit as the last. To this third series of questions there are no replies. See them in Cranmer's "*Letters*" (Parker Soc. ed. p. 153.)

¹ That is *secretly* as hitherto.

"If the mass should be wholly in english" says Bush of Bristol "I think men should differ from the custom and manner of all other regions". Worcester, Chichester, and Hereford when further pressed by the additional interrogatories declared that: "We ought to use such rites and prayers as the Catholic church hath and doth uniformly observe" and they based their objection to "the whole mass in english" on the principle that "an uniformity of all churches in that thing is to be kept."

It seems certain that at this time Cranmer did not feel himself in a position to press upon the English church changes in the liturgy beyond the point to which the more conservative among the bishops were prepared to go. How far that was is expressed by bishop Tunstall. After maintaining that latin should still be used in the mass, especially "in the mysteries thereof," he adds "nevertheless certain prayers might be in the mother tongue for the instruction and stirring of the devotion of the people as shall be thought convenient." This was the course actually adopted in issuing the Communion Book at this time.

It must be remembered that the sole object of this book was to provide for communion under both kinds, now ordered by parliament, in place of the communion of the host alone as had hitherto been the practice. The printing of "the Order of Communion" — a booklet of only three or four leaves — was finished on 8 March 1548. To it was prefixed, by way of preface a proclamation without date by the king "to all and singular our loving subjects", imposing the order. At this point the action of the king stops. "The next care was" writes Heylyn "to see the said order put in execution, of which the lords of the Council discharged the king and took the

whole burden on themselves, causing a sufficient number of the printed copies to be sent to each bishop in the realm" with a letter, dated 15 March, requiring them to take such measures "that every parson, vicar and curate may have sufficient time well to instruct and advise themselves for the distribution of the most holy communion according to the order of the said book before Easter following",¹ 1 April 1548.

The letter concluded with a vague and general menace to the clergy at large as answerable for the reception of the book, which was thus "set forth to the intent there should be in all parts of this realm and among all men one uniform manner quietly used".

The "Order of Communion" thus imposed by the ruling powers left the latin mass, according to the various rites hitherto in use in England, still intact. "The varying of any rite or ceremony in the mass", up to and including the communion of the priest, is expressly forbidden by a rubric of this "Order".

The book itself was composed of two parts: the first consisted merely of a notice of communion, stating the day upon which "the parson intends to minister" it. The second is a long and novel order for the rite of communion to the laity. The former was not interpolated in the mass; but the time, manner and even the place of this warning is left to the priest's discretion. Remembering that this was addressed to a people still Catholic in mind and practice there is little in the "warning" to which exception can be taken², unless it be a passage at

¹ Heylyn, *Hist. of the Ref.* ed. 1664, I. p. 59.

² One expression in the address may be noticed. It would have been sufficient to say; "to give us His body and blood"; but the word *spiritually* is added. This in itself is not incorrect;

the close "requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that doth use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest". This clearly recognizes officially a disuse of sacramental confession. There is however another aspect in which this address must be considered. Hitherto communion could be, and was, administered at any mass¹. The very rubric in this new order of communion indicates this ancient usage in prescribing the necessary preparation for the new mode. "As heretofore" it says "usually the priest hath done with the sacrament of the Body, to prepare bless and consecrate so much as will serve the people, so it shall yet continue still after the same manner and form". Communion however as contemplated by the new ritual was to be restricted to the time of which public notice had been given "the next sunday or holyday or at least one day before". As a fact this restriction of Communion for the laity really prepared the way for a further change, since Cranmer had already expressed his wish for the abolition of masses at which there were no communicants². It was consequently one step in that direction to prevent communicants receiving at the private masses.

The second part of the book is a ritual of communion under both kinds. It commences immediately after the communion of the priest and contemplates

but, taken in connection with Cranmer's known views at the time and with subsequent events, the insertion cannot be regarded as unintentional. This view is confirmed by certain expressions in the "Order" itself.

¹ It should be borne in mind that in most churches throughout the country many masses would be daily said.

² Burnet II 1. pp. 140—2. Here as in so many matters Cranmer

the intending communicants already assembled at the altar steps. It concludes with a special blessing to dismiss them thence to their places. The prayers directed to be said were subsequently incorporated in the communion service of the first Book of Common Prayer. A few general remarks on the new rite are all that need be here given.

The ritual preparation for the communion in the liturgies of the western church, at least from the time of St. Gregory, has always been of the simplest character. Until the later middle ages it consisted of nothing more than the Lord's Prayer, and another short prayer amplifying the last petition "Deliver us from evil". To these later devotion added one or more prayers which varied from diocese to diocese and gradually became incorporated in the local missals¹. For the communion of the laity in addition the form though unsettled was much as at present.

Thus although the new order of communion must certainly have been a startling introduction to a people accustomed to the old and simple rite, it need not have presented the same insuperable difficulties as it would to those now accustomed to a form long unvaried. Whilst it is impossible not to feel with a certain sense of disquiet the innovating spirit which runs through the whole, or to overlook the

covers his meaning with discreet care, but taking into consideration the questions 5 and 6 and all the replies thereto there can be no doubt what he means in this case.

¹ The Carthusians and Dominicans still have only one of the three prayers now found in the Roman missal; these do not appear to have been introduced into that missal before the close of the 13th century at the earliest. As to forms of communion see for instance Daniel, *Cod. liturg.* I, 147—8; Amort, *Vetus discipl. Canoniorum*, p. 692; Hoeyne, *Geschichte der kirchl. Liturgie des Bisthums Augsburg*, pp. 134—6, 301.

definite manifestation of uncatholic intent which here and there betrays itself, it may be said that the prayers, like the address, contain little to which definite objection can be taken¹.

Thus much having been said of the Communion Book, it is proper now to see how it was regarded by a contemporary deeply interested in the matter, and whose opinion as to its real object and effect is probably correct. The well known Miles Coverdale writing from Frankfort to Calvin on 26 March, 1548, only a fortnight after the book was issued to the bishops, says: — "I cannot but avail myself, most illustrious sir, of the offered opportunity of saluting your worthiness. There was brought hither three days since, during the time of the fair, a certain little book in english, containing that order of Holy Communion which the king's majesty has set forth as suitable to the present time. And as I perceived many persons were desirous of obtaining it, I forthwith translated it into german and latin. And therefore, when I understood the godly bearer of this letter to be a townsman of yours, I thought I should gratify your reverence by sending you this trifling present. One of the translations I intended for the

¹ The unnecessary use of the word "spiritually"; the expressions "minister the *bread*" -- "minister the *wine*"; the consecration, or, if necessary, repeated consecrations of the chalice alone, point to innovation. On the other hand, the insertion of the words "which was given for thee" -- "which was shed for thee" in the formula for communion, and the monition that "men must not think less to be received in part (of the consecrated host) than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ", emphasize the ancient doctrine. It would almost seem that the action of two minds working with different intentions is to be traced in the composition of this 'Order of Communion'.

Germans; the other, namely the latin one, I am exceedingly anxious should be forwarded to your reverence. And should you feel inclined to make known to others this cause for congratulation, the first fruits of godliness (according as the Lord now wills his religion to revive in England) you will be able to commit this token of my affection for you to the press more easily than I can. I am now on my return to England having been invited thither after an exile of eight years. Farewell, most excellent master, and affectionately salute your wife, who deserved so well from me and mine when we went to Strasburg".¹

The conviction of Coverdale that the new Order of Communion would be a source of gratification to Calvin and a cause for congratulation as "the first fruits of godliness" is full of significance.

Nothing has yet been said as to the authors of the book. The King's proclamation prefixed to it states that he had "caused sundry of his most grave and well learned prelates to assemble themselves for this matter, who, after long conference together, with deliberate advice finally agreed upon" the Order of Communion issued. Foxe adds that these learned men assembled "in the castle of Windsor".

The names of the churchmen who composed the committee are given, but diversely by different writers. The body however has obtained an established place in history as "the celebrated Windsor commission".² Of commission in any formal sense of the

¹ *Original Letters*. Parker Society pp. 31—2.

² Dixon II. 493. The whole question of the Windsor assembly will be considered when the compilation of the first Prayer Book is dealt with.

term no trace has been found after a careful examination of records printed and unprinted. It has already been seen that a series of questions was submitted to the majority of the bishops for their opinion. It is almost certain that these interrogatories were preparatory to this Order for Communion. But the names of those who actually compiled the Order are unknown. Few things tend more to obscure the real facts of history than the assumption of certainty where evidence is wanting. It is surely best to avow ignorance where nothing is known.

But whoever may have been the author or authors of the 'Order', there is no doubt as to the authority which imposed it upon the church. "Our pleasure is", says the king in his proclamation which serves as preface to the book, "by the advice of our most dear uncle the duke of Somerset, governor of our person and protector of all our realms, dominions and subjects, and other of our privy Council, that the said Blessed Sacrament be ministered unto our people only after such form and manner as hereafter by our authority with the advice before mentioned is set forth and declared".

Coverdale was not wrong, as the event proved, in greeting the book as merely "the first fruits of godliness". The king, it is true, admonished in this proclamation advanced innovators like Coverdale himself "to stay and quiet themselves with this our direction... and not enterprise to run afore and so by their rashness to become the greatest hinderers" of change. But at the same time he speaks of a "most earnest intent further to travail for the reformation and setting forth of such godly orders", and concludes: "We would not have our subjects so much to mislike our judgment, so much to mistrust our zeal, as though we either could not discern

what were to be done or would not do all things in due time. God be praised, we know what by His word is meet to be redressed, and have an earnest mind by the advice of our most dear uncle and other of our privy Council with all diligence and certain speed so to set forth the same, as it may most stand with God's glory, and edifying and quietness of our people; which we doubt not but all our obedient and loving subjects will quietly and reverently tarry for".

With the same intent Edward prescribes in the rubric of the book itself that the rite then issued is to stand only "until other orders shall be provided".

This word of "quietness" is the note continually struck in the documents issuing from the government in this reign. The methods taken to insure such peace and quiet cannot but excite astonishment. In the present case, where minds were already stirred, it might have seemed to most men sufficient to introduce an innovation touching every man's most sacred feelings, without giving a warning that this was merely a temporary measure, and thus opening out to the nation a vista of indefinite change. How the real intention was practically brought home to the people and the effect it had upon them will appear in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII.

PROCLAMATIONS AND PREACHING.

The series of proclamations and orders which at this period followed one another with such rapidity, even now produces in the mind a sense of confusion, and it is almost impossible to gain a precise notion of what was ordered to be done and what to be left undone. Although a single purpose may now be discerned in all, at first sight there appears to be a vacillation which almost amounts to contradiction. Any private alteration in the ancient rites is stringently forbidden with the proviso, "until the king shall please to alter". It is evident that the king's Council fully understood that these constant changes would set men's minds in a ferment, and yet they did not hesitate to prescribe them. On 6 February 1548 one of this series of proclamations was issued. Whilst it stringently forbade, with redundancy of language, any deviation from the ancient ceremonial on pain of imprisonment, on the other hand it provided immunity for such as should not observe certain ritual usages, attacked by the Council a week before, if not quite abolished. "Considering" runs the document "nothing so much to tend to the disquiet of this realm as diversity of opinions and variety of rites and ceremonies concerning religion and worship of almighty God" yet the king "is adver-

tised that certain private curates, preachers and other laymen . . . do rashly attempt of their own and singular wit and mind in some parish churches and otherwise not merely to persuade the people from the old and accustomed rites and ceremonies but also themselves bringeth in new orders every one in the church according to their phantasies. . . Wherefore his Majesty straightly commandeth that no manner of person . . . do omit, leave done, change, alter or innovate any order, rite or ceremony commonly used or frequented in the church of England and not commanded to be left undone at any time in the reign of our late sovereign lord his Highness' father, other than such as his Highness by his Majesty's visitors' injunctions or proclamations hath already or hereafter shall command to be omitted, left, innovated or changed ; but that they be observed after that sort as before they were accustomed, or else now since prescribed by the authority of his Majesty or by the means aforesaid". All offenders against this proclamation, "shall incur his Highness' indignation and suffer imprisonment and other grievous punishment at his Majesty's will and pleasure".

Having declared this much the document immediately proceeds to make exception in a form not at all clear until some explanation is given. "For not bearing a candle on Candlemasday, not taking ashes upon Ash-Wednesday, not bearing palms on Palm Sunday, not creeping to the cross, not taking holy bread or holy water, or for omitting other such rites and ceremonies concerning religion and the use of the church, which the most Reverend Father in God, the archbishop of Canterbury by his Majesty's will and command, with the advice" of the Duke of Somerset and others of the Council "hath declared or hereafter shall declare to the other bishops by

his writing under seal to be omitted or changed, no man hereafter to be imprisoned nor otherwise punished".¹

It will be noticed that this last provision is merely a declaration of immunity for such as do not observe the ceremonies in question. It thus contemplates their observance, and their non-observance, and the need of such a proviso is explained by the previous attitude of members of the Council towards these Catholic practices. Steps had already been taken by the ruling powers to inform the clergy of their resolution to abrogate them. On 27 January 1548 Craumer addressed to Bonner, who as dean of the province of Canterbury was charged to communicate such documents to the rest of the bishops, his "letters missive," containing this in effect; "that my Lord Protector's Grace, with the advice of other the King's Majesty's Honourable Privy Council (for certain considerations them moving) are fully resolved, that no candles shall be borne on Candlemas-day; nor also from henceforth ashes or palms used any longer; requiring me (Bonner) thereupon by his said letters, to cause admonition and knowledge thereof, to be given unto your lordship and other bishops with celerity accordingly... that you thereupon may give knowledge and advertisement thereof within your diocese, as appertaineth"².

It will be noticed again that this is not a royal proclamation formally abrogating these ceremonies, but a mere intimation of the will of the governing powers, and, it may fairly be asked how an ecclesiastic in view of such instructions and such a proclamation could well see his way, with pains of

¹ Burnet II. 2. p. 129.

² Heylyn. *Eccl. Restaurata* I. p. 55.

imprisonment at least threatened, to arrange for these suggested changes. On the one hand there was no order, but merely the intimation of a full intention and resolution of the government, and on the other there were pains and penalties declared for non-observance of the ancient ceremonies, except in so far as they were abrogated by command of Henry VIII or Edward VI. Had the Council determined to try to bring about "a variety of rites and ceremonies" it could hardly have adopted better means.

Whatever may be thought, moreover, of the ceremonies themselves, they are unquestionably rites to which the popular mind is deeply attached. Three centuries of disuse have not entirely effaced the old idea of palms for Palm Sunday among the english peasantry. A Catholic population does not feel that Lent has begun for them unless they have been sprinkled with the blessed ashes. And, notwithstanding all changes, the old familiar name of Candlemas has ever in England remained associated with the feast of our Lady's Purification. All these ceremonies thus struck at and the processions already forbidden gave a pleasing variety to the regular liturgy; or, as Ash Wednesday and Palm Sunday, gave warning of the penitential time of Lent, or of the approach of the solemn and singular rites of Holy Week. Thus the abolition of these observances among a people who had never been accustomed to anything else but Catholic rites was nothing less than a rude uprooting of old habits and associations connected with all that was most sacred in their lives.

The circumstances moreover did not serve to lessen the shock to popular feeling. "The counsel was as sudden" writes Heylyn "as the warning short, for (the letter) being dated on 28 January it was not

possible that any reform should be made in the first particular, but only in the cities of London and Westminster and the parts adjoining, the feast of the Purification falling within five days after. But yet the Lords drove on so fast that before this order could be published in the remote parts of the kingdom, they followed it with another (as little pleasing to the main body of the people) concerning images" ¹.

This latter order in Council affords so clear an insight into the state of discord and disorder into which these measures had thrown the entire country, that it deserves notice here. The Council first complain that on their previous order for taking down "images abused with pilgrimages, offerings or censures, much strife and contention hath risen and daily riseth and daily more and more encreaseth about the execution of the same. Some men.. would by their good wills retain all such images still.. and almost in every place is contention for images, whether they have been abused or not.. Considering therefore" the document proceeds "that almost in no part of this realm is any sure quietness but where all images be clean taken away and pulled down already" the bishops are ordered "immediately upon sight hereof.. to give order that all the images remaining in any church or chapel be removed and taken away. And in the execution hereof" the order concludes "we require both you (Cranmer) and the rest of the said bishops to use such foresight as the same may be quietly done, with as good satisfaction to the people as may be. From Somerset place, 11 February" ².

¹ Heylyn. *Eccl. Rest.* I p. 55.

² Ibid p. 56 Heylyn had evidently seen Thirlby's Register, and says that Bonner's letter to the Bp. of Westminster conveying this order bears the date 20 February.

Meantime, whilst on the one hand the Council were issuing orders to restrain innovations in the liturgy and on the other were allowing it to be understood that such innovations were not displeasing to them, the policy of essaying yet further changes under the eye of the court was revived. At Easter this year, 1548, "there began" as the Grey Friars' chronicle relates "the communion, and confession but of those that would, as the book doth specify"¹. In May appeared a novelty in the cathedral church of the metropolis for which as yet there was no warrant. "Paul's choir and divers other parishes in London" writes Wriothesley "sung all the service in english, both matins and evensong, and kept no mass without some received the communion with the priest"².

Also "on the 12th of May (1548) king Henry VII anniversary was kept at Westminster; the mass sung all in english with the consecration of the Sacrament also spoken in english, the priest leaving out all the canon after the creed save the *Pater Noster* and then ministered the communion after the kings book". The sermon at this mass was "made by Mr. Tong the king's chaplain"³.

The description of this service at Westminster is strikingly like a mass on the model of Luther's so called "Latin mass", with the addition of the

¹ Camden. Soc. p. 55.

² *Chronicle*. Camden Soc. II, p. 2. If the answers of Cranmer to the questions 1. 2. 5 and 6 noticed in the last chapter are considered, there can be little doubt as to the inspiration of this latter regulation.

³ Wriothesley. *ibid*. In the churchwardens' accounts of St. Michael's Cornhill for 1548, occurs this item: "Paid to the school-master of Paul's for writing of the mass in english and the Benedicites (sic) 5 shillings": also "eight psalters in english" were bought (ed. Overall. pp. 67, 68.)

"Order of Communion" put forth in the previous March. It is impossible also not to see in it a first draft of "the supper of the Lord, commonly called the mass" as it appeared in the first Book of Common Prayer issued the next year. The question further arises what "matins and even-song" had been used in english by certain London churches in the May of the year 1548? Were they a translation of the daily varying offices of the ancient breviary; or did they resemble the unvarying services of the subsequent Prayer Book?

Less than a fortnight after this strange service at Westminster, John ab Ulmis, a Swiss studying at Oxford, writes to Bullinger his first impressions, evidently somewhat exaggerated, of the religious situation in England. "The number of faithful" he says "is daily encreasing in vast multitudes more and more. The mass, that darling of the papists, is shaken and in many places it is dismissed. The images too are extirpated root and branch in every part of England nor is there left the least trace which can afford a hope or handle to the papists for confirming their error respecting images. Peter Martyr has maintained the cause of the Eucharist and Holy Supper of the Lord; namely that it is a remembrance of Christ and a solemn setting forth of his death and not a sacrifice. Meanwhile however he speaks with caution and prudence, if indeed it can be called such, with respect to the real presence, so as not to seem to incline either to your opinion or to that of Luther. But the public preachers for the most part openly and candidly confute according to their ability the notion of a carnal partaking and have brought over a considerable number to this their opinion. The capernaïtes, papists and this class of sarcophagists are not sleeping"¹.

¹) *Orig. Lett.* Parker Soc. pp. 377—8.

Although it is clear from the rest of this letter that the writer could not have had intimate knowledge of what was taking place in England, still his first impressions of the situation are valuable. In regard to the boldness with which preachers in their sermons attacked Catholic practices he is undoubtedly correct in what he says. Thus in his famous sermon "of the Plough" preached at St. Paul's on 18 January of this year 1548, under the eye of the court, Latimer had plainly inveighed against Catholic usages, declaring them and the mass itself to be the work of the devil. "His office" said he "is to hinder religion, to maintain superstition, to set up idolatry, to teach all kind of popery... Where the devil is resident, and hath his plough going, there away with books, and up with candles; away with bibles, and up with beads; away with the light of the Gospel, and up with the light of candles yea at noon-days. Where the devil is resident, that he may prevail, up with all superstition and idolatry; censing, painting of images, candles, palms, ashes, holy water and new service of men's inventing; ... Down with Christ's cross, up with purgatory pickpurse, up with him, the popish purgatory, I mean... Let all things be done in latin: there must be nothing but latin, not so much as *memento homo quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris*, which be the words that the minister speaketh unto the ignorant people, when he giveth them ashes upon Ash-Wednesday; but it must be spoken in latin; God's word may in no wise be translated into english".¹

Further "this is the mark at which the devil shooteth, to evacuate the cross of Christ, and to mingle the institution of the Lord's supper... These

¹ Latimer *Sermons*. Parker Soc. pp. 70—71.

1500 years he hath been a doer, only purposing to evacuate Christ's death and to make it of small efficacy and virtue. For whereas Christ, according as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, so would he himself be exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in him should have salvation, but the devil would none of that: they would have us saved by a daily oblation propitiatory, by a sacrifice expiatory or remissory"¹. The autobiography of Thomas Hancock, a preacher licensed by archbishop Cranmer, affords another specimen of the sermons countenanced and protected by authority at this period. The narrative covers the close of the year 1547 and the beginning of 1548. Preaching at Christ Church in Hampshire, his native place, in the presence of the vicar "the priest being then at mass, I declared" he says, "unto the people that what the priest doth hold over his head, they did see with their bodily eyes; but our Saviour Christ doth" in the text 'Because I go to the Father' (John XVI.8) "say plainly that we shall see him no more. Then you that do kneel unto it, pray unto it and honour it as God, do make an idol of it and yourselves do commit most horrible idolatry"².

Not long after this, apparently on 31 January 1548, he preached in the church of St. Thomas at Salisbury in the presence of the chancellors of the bishops of Salisbury and Winchester and divers other priests and laymen. After inveighing against "superstitious ceremonies, as holy bread, holy water, images, copes, vestments &c." he proceeded "at the last against the idol of the altar, proving it to be an idol and no God". Once more he told his audience "that

¹ Ibid. pp. 72—3.

² *Narratives of the Reformation*. Camd. Soc. p. 72.

which the priest holdeth over his head you do see, you kneel before it, you honour it and make an idol of it and you yourselves are most horrible idolaters" ¹.

Such was the tenor of the sermons of a preacher licensed by the archbishop to a people still Catholic in heart and belief. In the circumstances what could the Catholic clergy, powerless to prevent one sent with authority from speaking, do, but leave the church as they actually did; Hancock meantime "charging them that they were not of God, because they refused to hear the word of God". The civil powers, however, did not consider themselves bound by Cranmer's licence; and "the sermon being ended, the mayor Mr. Thomas Chafyn came unto me, laying to my charge a proclamation, in the which was commandment given that we should give no nickname unto the Sacrament, as *round robbin* or *Jack in the box*; whereto I answered, that it was no Sacrament, but an idol, as they do use it. At that time was one Hunt and Richard White committed to the gaol for such cause by Dr. Geffrey, who was chancellor to bishop Capon, and so would the mayor also have committed me to the gaol had not six honest men been bound for me, that I should answer at the next assizes" ².

At these assizes Hancock was bound in his own recognizances of £ 90 and in those of ten others of £ 10 each "that he should not go before the king in his proceedings". "This done I rode from Salisbury unto my lord of Somerset's grace who lay at that time at Sion. I requested his grace that I might have his letter for the discharge of them that were

¹ Ibid. p. 73.

² pp. 73—4.

bound for me: he caused my lord treasurer, his honour that now is, who then was master of the requests', to write to my lord chief justice for the discharge of the bond... And thus were my friends of Sarum that were bound for me discharged of their bond"².

Such countenance from Somerset could hardly fail to encourage a man of Hancock's mind, especially as he was forthwith made "minister of God's word in the town of Poole". Here he had the same gospel to deliver. And when, some sunday in Juli, dilating on his old theme that God was invisible "the priest at that time being at mass", he went on to say: "if it be so that no man hath seen God, nor can see God with these bodily eyes, then that which the priest lifteth over his head is not God, for you do see it with your bodily eyes, — if it be not God, you may not honour it as God nor for God. Whereat one Thomas Whyte, a great rich merchant and a ringleader of the papists, rose out of his seat and went out of the church saying, 'come from him good people; he came from the devil and teacheth unto you devilish doctrine'. John Northerell, *alias* John Spicer, followed him saying, 'It shall be God when thou shalt be but a knave'³.

Hancock's preaching at this place also and his conduct to the clergy whom, though he was merely a preacher, he considered to be at his command, resulted towards the close of 1548 in a riot. Once more he had recourse to Somerset and through him obtained "another letter for my quietness in preaching God's word in the town of Poole"⁴.

¹ William Cecil (afterwards Lord Burghley).

² pp. 76—7.

³ *Ibid.* p. 78.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 79. The whole narrative deserves to be read. It is

The men primarily responsible for these scandals were obviously Somerset and Cranmer. To the latter by proclamation dated 24 April 1548 was reserved the sole power of granting permission to preach; "all manner of other preachers being inhibited".¹ Early in June (1548) instructions were issued by the Privy Council to all the licensed preachers, and the object was as usual declared to be to secure "quietness". The means to be taken thereto was "to instil" into the people "their duty to their heads and rulers; obedience to laws and orders appointed by the superiors who have rule of God". Wherefore the royal preachers were admonished "that in no wise they do stir and provoke the people to any alteration or innovation other than is already set forth by the king's Majesty's injunctions, homilies and proclamations... Rebuking those who will take upon them to run before they be sent, to go before the rulers, to alter and change things in religion without authority; teaching them to expect and tarry the time which God hath ordained to the revealing of all truth". Bearing in mind also that "it is not a preacher's part to bring that into contempt and hatred which the prince doth either allow or is content to suffer". Meantime, as the proclamation goes on to declare, "the king's Highness by our advice... doth not cease to labour and travail by all godly means that his realm may be brought and kept in a most godly and Christian order, who only may and ought to do it".

particularly interesting as showing how Somerset made himself personally accessible to preachers of this type and how readily any "going before" the king's proceedings was condoned. It is instructive, too, as to the attitude of the people towards the innovators.

¹ Heylyn. *Eccl. Rest.* I pp. 59—60.

At the same time it was "not his Majesty's mind to extinct... the lively teaching of the word of God by sermons made after such sort as for the time the Holy Ghost shall put into the preacher's mind". And whilst inculcating humility and patience, and comforting the weak, the preachers were not to hesitate to teach the people the right way; "and to flee all erroneous superstitions, as the confidence in pardons, pilgrimages, beads, religious images and other such of the bishop of Rome's traditions and superstitions, with his usurped power".

In a word the duty of the king's preacher is declared to be "obediently (to) follow himself and teach likewise others to follow and observe that which is commanded", and generally, "not to think himself wiser than the king's majesty and his Council". Lastly the Council is of opinion that "what is abolished, taken away, reformed and commanded it is easy to see by the acts of parliament the injunctions, proclamations and homilies".¹

This and similar documents, as well as the general tenor of the ecclesiastical acts of the government in the reign of Edward VI, show that a startling and marked change had taken place in the idea of the Church and of the nature of spiritual power since the death of Henry VIII. Although Edward's father claimed in its fulness the powers of supreme Head, the idea of the Church with an actual spiritual jurisdiction was still a living reality to him. But the governing powers under Edward nowhere, either in their declarations or actions, show that they recognized any such idea. All was summed up in the "royal and kingly office".

¹ Burnet. II. 2. pp. 130—2, letter of the Council, dated 13 May and "printed at London 1 June 1548".

Somerset and Cranmer through their licensed preachers thus used the pulpit as a means for bringing about the changes which they desired. It was employed also for another purpose. By requiring men known to be unfavourable to change to preach publicly at Paul's Cross on certain prescribed topics they put their most prominent opponents to a public test of compliance with the "king's proceedings". Bishop Gardiner was the first to be subjected to this novel mode of trial.

This prelate had been released from the Fleet prison, where he had been kept during the sitting of Parliament, on 7 January 1548. Although told that he was included in a general pardon he was asked before leaving his prison to sign a form "touching justification". On Thursday (January 12) he went to Somerset's house at Sheen, with his written opinion on the subject; this however not being satisfactory seven days later he was required to appear before the Council, when, for refusing to adopt the required form, he was committed to his own house as a prisoner.

In Lent however he was discharged and allowed to return to his episcopal duties at Winchester. But within a fortnight of his coming home "other business came out of a request made by Somerset to surrender a college at Cambridge". On Easter Sunday (1 April 1548) the Council sent him a letter from Greenwich, stating that they had been lately advertised of disorders of seditious persons in Winchester, a great part being traced to the bishop's servants and others turning people's minds against things ordered by the king's authority. The Council consequently direct that the bishop is to dismiss his servants "and also to the end his lordship should bear no suspicion of the blame imputed to his servants" he is commanded "to put himself in order

to repair up hither, within fourteen days next ensuing, here to remain".¹

Gardiner pleaded sickness and was respited, but three days before Whitsunday (20 May 1548) other letters peremptorily ordered him to wait on the Council, his plea of sickness not being credited. Being at the time unable to ride he was carried to London in a horse litter. On his appearance before the Council Somerset objected certain articles "written in a paper" against him, including the maintenance of certain ceremonies in his Cathedral at Winchester during the past Holy Week.²

The replies made by the bishop not being deemed sufficient Somerset commanded him to remain in London. This he objected to do, if he was to be considered a prisoner, and in the end he was ordered to write his mind on "ceremonies".

For the next month no further step appears to have been taken; but towards the end of the month of June he was ordered to preach a sermon approving what had been done in regard to the Pope, the suppression of monasteries, shrines and chantries, the abolition of candles and ashes, the obligation of auricular confession, and processions, and the establishment of Common Prayer in english.³ The feast of SS. Peter and Paul (29 June) was fixed for this compulsory sermon.

He was consequently not merely commanded to

¹ Council Bk. Harl. Ms. 352 f. 68 d.

² Among the points objected to Gardiner was that he had allowed "the Easter Sepulchre". This practice had not been forbidden, though doubtless it was like other ancient ceremonies distasteful to those in power.

³ It will be noticed that this was ordered in June 1548, when the Common Prayer in english had not yet been imposed, or even publicly proposed.

express his approval of what had actually been done, but also of what Somerset and Cranmer proposed to do. Cecil was deputed to convey the Protector's orders to the bishop. It was first proposed that Gardiner should submit the draft of his sermon for examination and approval. This he refused, maintaining that he was no offender; he also refused to preach "papers of another man's device". Upon this refusal he became for a few hours, as he himself declares, practically a prisoner in Somerset's house.

On Monday, 25 June, Cecil warned him that the king himself would note every principal sentence "and especially if it touched the King's Majesty". Two days later Cecil was again sent to urge the bishop not to touch in his sermon upon the Sacrament of the altar and the mass, since "the questions and controversies rest at the present in consultation and with the pleasure of God shall be in small time by public doctrine and authority quietly and truly determined".¹

Gardiner replied "that he could no wise forbear to speak of the Sacrament, neither of the mass; this last being the chief foundation of our religion, and that without it we cannot know that Christ is our sacrifice". And as to the Blessed Sacrament he declared that, as it was then so defamed by many, if he did not speak his mind and what he thought of it he knew what other men would think of him. He concluded by expressing his desire that Somerset would not meddle in these matters of religion, but that the care of them should be committed to the bishops "unto whom the blame, if any should be deserved, might well be imputed".²

¹ Somerset to Gardiner. Burnet II. 2. p. 154.

² Ibid. p. 155.

The following day, Thursday 28 June, the Protector communicated his mind to Gardiner in regal style. He expressly ordered him by the king's authority to abstain from treating of any matter of controversy concerning the Sacrament and the mass, which was "necessarily reserved for a public consultation and at this present utterly to be forborne for the common quiet".

The tone of this letter, which reached the bishop between three and four in the afternoon of the day before his sermon, gave him material for reflection. "From four o'clock on Thursday" he says "till I had done my sermon on Friday I did neither drink, eat nor sleep".

The actual scene of the sermon cannot be better described than in the words of one who shows himself always well informed and who records the rumours, true or false, current at the time, as to the circumstances under which Gardiner was compelled to preach. "The day before yesterday" writes Odet de Selve to the french king "the bishop of Winchester preached at great length before the king of England and all the Council and a great multitude of people. He maintained, as I have heard, the direct contrary of all the new opinions now approved, . . . especially in regard to the mass and Holy Sacrament of the altar; saying that he would rather be burnt a hundred times than deviate from what the Church has determined thereupon: and that he would think himself happy to die in such a quarrel. And yesterday evening he was taken a prisoner to the Tower, which every one thinks he will never leave unless it be to lose his life, for he was marvellously vehement, as people are saying, in condemning the innovations in this country, even to the point of saying to the king's face that he could not

and ought not to usurp the title of Supreme Head of the Church'. Some say that he had been expressly ordered to preach this sermon in public and in presence of the king of England, to declare and set forth what he held on each point of religion enjoined by the king, because he had refused to put his judgment on paper; so that he was forced either to speak against his conscience or to say what he has said. And others who are unfavourable to him say that he himself had schemed to preach this sermon before the king to get a hearing for this once, so as to disburden himself of what he had in his heart"².

The story would not be complete without some account of the official version put forth of the whole process against Gardiner. On Sunday, 1 July, the Council addressed a letter to the english ambassadors abroad to enable them to declare where necessary "the manner of Gardiner's proceedings, the warning given and great favour³, many ways showed to him". The letter sets forth that the king, by the advice of the lord Protector and the Council "thinking requisite for sundry considerations to have a general visitation throughout the realm⁴, and, by the advice of sundry bishops and other the best learned men of the realm, appointed certain orders and injunctions to be generally observed". These orders were

¹ There is nothing in the sermon as recorded which bears out this statement. Nor is it likely in the circumstances that Gardiner would have taken this line. It was probably founded on rumour and shows at least the excited state of the public mind.

² *Inventaire Analytique* &c. pp. 397—8.

³ In the original draft the word was *gentleness*, afterwards changed into *favour*.

⁴ In the draft originally the expression was: "thinking good to have many abuses reformed".

"of all men of all sorts obediently received and executed saving only by this man who... showed such a wilful disobedience therein as, if it had not been quickly espied, might have bred much unquietness and trouble. For his lewd proceedings... he was only sequestered to the Fleet where he remained for a short time as much at his ease as if he had been in his own house".¹ On promise of conformity he was liberated and allowed to return to his diocese which became a scene of contention. "Besides this we were informed that, to withstand such as he thought to have been from us, he had caused all his servants to be secretly armed and harnessed".

"When called before the Council upon a renewed promise we did yet leave him at liberty, only requiring him to remain at his house of London... He was no sooner come to his house but he began to meddle in matters where he neither had commission nor authority, in such matters also as touched the king's Majesty's right; and being yet again admonished by us, the Lord Protector, he did not only promise to conform himself in all things like a good subject, but also, because he understood that he was diversely reported of, and many were also offended with him, he offered to declare to the world his conformity, and promised in an open sermon so to (declare) his mind in sundry articles agreed upon, that such as had been offended should not from thenceforth have any such cause to be offended, but well satisfied in all things: declaring further that as he, in his own conscience was well satisfied and liked well the king's Majesty's proceedings within this realm, so would he utter his conscience abroad to the satisfaction and good quiet of others".

¹ Cf. Gardiner's account p. 58, *ante*.

"And yet all this notwithstanding at the day appointed he did both most arrogantly and disobediently speak of certain matters contrary to an express commandment given unto him; and also in the rest of the articles whereunto he had agreed before, he used such a seditious manner of utterance in the presence of the king's Majesty, of us all, and of a very great audience, as was very like to have even there publicly stirred a great tumult".

"He has showed himself" the Council concluded "an open great offender and very seditious man".¹

Gardiner's sermon² has rightly been described as one of the most remarkable documents of the age. It would not be proper to take it as a free and unfettered expression of his preferences, or as a declaration of his opinion as to what in itself was best or most fitting. The bishop took the circumstances as he found them and "condescended" to measures he had no power to hinder. This method of compliance was deliberately adopted in the hope of saving the essential feature of the ancient system which still remained. On reading his sermon there can be no doubt as to his intention and aim. He accepted what had been done in order to secure at least the maintenance of the mass.

Had Gardiner been met "in a like mind by the reformers" not only "England might never have had to lament the Marian persecution"; but the nation might have been spared much that is most painful in its later religious history.

¹ State Papers. Domestic. Ed. VI. Volume IV No. 20. (1 July 1548).

² In C. C. C. C. MS. 127 f. 15 seqq: are notes of this sermon taken probably at the time. Though agreeing in sense they differ considerably in expression from the printed version.

But this question had already been decided in the minds of those who had the real control of ecclesiastical affairs. There was no hesitation on their part as to the answer to be given him. The next night he was lodged in the Tower of London. "There for a whole year less six days" he writes "I was left unheard, not seeing any man except my chaplain once when I was ill, and from morning to night on Easter day"¹.

¹ Foxe VI. p. 72.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRESS AND THE MASS.

The pulpit was not the only means at the disposal of the government to prepare the way for the changes now meditated. The press, although apparently not so immediately under control as the pulpit, was at this date really in the power of the rulers. Here and there possibly a book might be published bearing the name of author and printer which was distasteful to Cranmer and the Council, but there can be no doubt that this would be done at the peril of those concerned. And as a fact on examining the bibliography of these years it is remarkable that hardly a single book or pamphlet written in support of the ancient doctrines appears to have been issued from the english press. Such treatises as those of Gardiner and Tunstall in behalf of the Sacrament had to be printed abroad, or if in England in secret.

On the other hand, the country was flooded with works, either translations of the labours of foreign reformers, or original compositions, inveighing against Catholic observance and especially against the mass. These bore the name of author or printer and were mostly of the booklet class, which could be sold

for a few pence and were evidently designed for wide circulation among the people. In the circumstances there can be no doubt whatever, that this style of literature, which is so abundant, could not have had currency without the connivance or the good will of the government, and that it really represents beyond question their wishes and intentions. Not merely was the circulation of such literature, which is chiefly of a profane and scurrilous character, not prohibited or even moderated by any of the numerous proclamations of the time, but express licence was given to printers of such works.

In 1547 these books are not numerous and were mostly printed abroad. Thus an english translation of Marcourt's "Declaration of the mass" was printed at Wittenberg, and a translation of Luther's "Disclosures of the Canon of the popish mass" was imprinted at "Have-at-all-papists", and was perhaps a secret publication of some english press. Bale was busy against the "papists" and the "mass" at Marburg, and Hooper published at Zurich, his answer to bishop Gardiner's work on the Sacrament which had appeared the preceding year ¹.

These books, aimed at Catholic customs and practices, were even in this year not circulated by stealth, as would have been necessary in Henry's reign, but were hawked about in the market towns for public sale. Thus as early as the end of May 1547 bishop

¹ According to Bullinger's diary Hooper had arrived in Zurich on 29 March 1547 (Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger*, p. 634) and Bullinger took him and his wife to reside in his own house, as he could not find a suitable lodging for him elsewhere. "I took him in gladly" writes Bullinger to Micronius in April "and with all my heart, for he is it seems to me a straightforward Christian". (Ibid. p. 258.)

Gardiner had written to Somerset that he had "seen of late two books set forth in english, by Bale, very pernicious, seditious and slanderous against religion". It grieved him "not a little to see so soon after" Henry's death these books "spread abroad" and "certain printers, players and preachers make a wonderment, as though we knew not yet how to be justified, nor what sacraments we should have" ¹. And a fortnight later he again writes: "as for Jack-o-Lent's English Testament, it was sold in Winchester market, before I wrote unto your grace of it: and as for Bale's book, called the *Elucidation of Anne Askew's martyrdom*, they were in these parts common, some with leaves unglued where master Paget was spoken of, and some with leaves glued. And I call them common, because I saw, at the least, four of them. As for Bale's book, touching the death of Luther, wherein was the duke of Saxony's prayer (whereof I wrote) it was brought down into this country by an honest gentleman, to whom it was given in London for news" ².

The books of 1547 opened the campaign against the mass: their general theme was the "enormities" of the Canon. By the old doctrine of transubstantiation "they have proved" writes Marcourt "almost the universal world to open and manifest idolatry" ³. Hooper had not yet made up his mind as to the Canon. "It should seem" he writes "by the canon of the mass that is at this day read, which was written in Gregory's time, that the mass was a communion". But as for private mass he was already convinced that it was "wicked and devilish" ⁴. In

¹ Foxe VI. p. 30.

² Ibid. p. 39. 6 June 1547.

³ *A declaration of the mass*, Biii.

⁴ Hooper. *Early Writings*. Parker Soc. p. 226

his then frame of mind he considered that the Holy Supper was "to be used as a communion unto all under both kinds, and not be made a mass that blasphemeth God. For such as honour the bread there for God do no less idolatry than they that made the sun their god or stars" ¹.

The great publication of this first year of Edward's reign was however the "Paraphrase of Erasmus" in its official english translation. Of this book bishop Gardiner complains very vehemently to Somerset calling attention to many false translations and errors. Especially he notes that "if this paraphrase go abroad, people shall be learned to call the Sacrament of the altar, 'holy bread' and a 'symbol' ².

At the close of the year the policy of the rulers became less guarded and the floodgates were opened. On 26 November 1547, the day upon which the bill for communion under both kinds was first read in the Lords, a licence was granted to Walter Lynne "to print or cause to be printed a certain book which is called in our vulgar tongue 'The beginning and ending of all popery', and all other manner of books consonant to godliness" ³. This work, a book with pictures, was filled with abuse of everything Catholic and was dedicated to the king himself and the Lord Protector. After such an advertisement no one could well fail to understand what was pleasing in the highest quarters. ⁴

¹ Ibid. p. 139.

² Foxe. ed. Townsend VI. p. 42.

³ R. O. *Privy Seals* 1 Ed. VI. Strype (*Eccle. Mem.* II p. 182) notes that a work by one "Luke, a physician" of London called *John Boon and Master Parson* took much at court at this time and the courtiers wore it in their pockets. No opportunity has occurred of examining *John Boon*.

⁴ This regulation of the press is illustrated at a later

In the year 1548 between twenty and thirty of such books against the Blessed Sacrament and the mass were published. They can in no sense be called books of controversy but were filled with blasphemous and profane abuse. Those moreover which are now known can only be regarded as samples of what actually were printed, since, as is obvious, such booklets readily disappear and those which survive are extreme rarities. Even the greatest public libraries do not contain copies of all that are known. A few extracts from the less scurrilous will be sufficient to indicate the temper displayed in them generally.

Anthony Gilby opened the way by an answer to bishop Gardiner's book on the Sacrament. It was published in January 1548, and it complains that the bishop's book in exposition of the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament "is spread everywhere and received in many places more reverently than the blessed Bible, the holy word of God". The Sacrament itself, the author of the reply stigmatizes "as the popish idol, the dumb God and poetical changeling". He points at Bucer's teachings on the subject; and whilst admitting that the German doctor had confuted "popish doctrine" he condemns the obscurity of the language of those who are "not content to say plainly a spade. As for me" he says "I have learnt to call bread, bread, and to speak al things plainly... You however," meaning the papists as he calls them, "will have a carnal change, a carnal presence, a carnal

date by a letter of Cranmer asking Cecil to obtain permission for him to publish his reply to Gardiner's book on the Sacrament. "And forasmuch" he writes "as both printing and selling of any matters in the english tongue is prohibited by a proclamation set forth, unless the same matter be first allowed by the king's Majesty, or six of his Majesty's Privy Council" he begs to have that leave. (*Remains*, Parker Soc. pp. 429—30).

sacrifice; a piece of paste, as we say, flesh and blood as ye say, to be carnally worshipped with fond gestures, a creature to be made a creator, a vile cake to be made God and man”¹.

An anonymous “Christian” thus utters his “Lamentacyon against the city of London for some certain great vices used therein”. “The great part of these inordinate rich, stiffnecked citizens will not have in their houses that lively word of our souls, nor suffer their servants to have it, neither yet gladly read it nor hear it read... Also the greatest part of the seniors or aldermen with the multitude of the inordinate rich. Even as the rich cried out against Christ... even so do the rich of the city of London take part and be fully bent with the false prophets the bishops and other stout, strong and sturdy priests of Baal to persecute unto death all and every godly person which either preacheth the word of God or setteth it forth in writing”.

Then, after reprobating various Catholic practices especially the invocation of Saints and honouring our Lady with the title of “Queen of Heaven”, the writer proceeds: “Ye will (to) have the service of God maintained in the church to God’s honour and yet by the same service is God dishonoured, for the Supper of the Lord is perverted and not used after Christ’s institution... and so is that holy institution turned into a vain superstitious ceremonial mass” and “thus hath he changed the holy memory of Christ’s death into the worshipping of his God, made of fine flour”².

These two specimens must suffice for a class of

¹ *An answer to the devillish detection of S. Gardiner Bp. of Winchester*, ff VI, XVI &c.

² *The Lamentacyon* &c. A. D. 1548. b ii and c vii.

literature which cannot but strike the reader with a sense of horror. The government never checked the issue of these productions, although, at the time, the doctrine against which they were directed was the received faith of the english people. The writers were mostly english although they drew their inspiration from abroad. The engrossing topic of Henry's divorce and the work of suppressing the monasteries had drawn away the attention of the nation at large from other matters; yet ever since Henry VIII and Fisher intervened in religious controversy with Æcolampadius and Luther, England was never isolated from the religious movements of the time. Foreigners were perfectly well aware of all that was taking place in England. They were kept informed by many channels of communication besides their intercourse with the religious exiles whom the strong measures of Henry against the new doctrines had forced to seek a resting place abroad. The hope entertained by the foreign reformers of seeing England drawn into the stream of change, kept up in them a living interest in the religious dispositions of the country¹. Henry's hand was heavy on the innovators, at least in the later years of his reign, and so far as was possible he kept their books and their teaching from being disseminated among his people. With

¹ The attempt to bring England and Protestant Germany into line in 1544--5 seems to have had its origin with Bucer. See Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, II. p. 275. Bucer's opinion of Henry is interesting: "Der könig ist für sein person wie er ist; so sind andere könig auch wie sie sind" (p. 273 cf. p. 268). But one consideration outweighed all the rest: "Cöllen ist ja ein schwer exempel, dass unss guter und mechtiger freunden auch wol konde von nöten sein" (p. 274).

Edward's accession, however, the will to restrain the circulation of the works of foreign reformers ceased to exist.

The knowledge of books and their diffusion even in distant parts was much more easy and rapid in the middle of the sixteenth century than is now commonly realized. It has already been pointed out that copies of the new Order of Communion which appeared in England in the spring of 1548 could be bought at Frankfort fair within a fortnight of its issue from the english press. And its translation had probably been perused by Calvin almost as soon as it had reached the clergy in the more remote parts of England.

During the year 1547 translations of two treatises by Melancthon had appeared, the first a tract on justification, the second an epistle to Henry VIII on the Six Articles. This latter, perhaps as touching the king's Majesty, bears no indication where it was printed. In the following year (1548) english versions of the works of many foreign reformers were issued from the press for english instruction. These were hardly less numerous than the original works. Amongst them were translations from the works of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Melancthon, Bullinger, Urbanus Regius, Osiander, Hegendorp, and Bodius¹. Even a translation of a little anonymous tract from Osiander's town of Nuremberg appeared in this year. This "Disputation between a Christian shoemaker and a

¹ Among the translations from Calvin of a later date that of his Catechism and *Form of Common Prayers used in the Church of Geneva* was printed by Whitchurch, one of the printers of the Prayer Book on 3 June 1550. Two editions of a translation of the *Pia Consultatio* or *Cologne Reformation* of archbishop Hermann had appeared in 1547 and 1548.

papist parson in Nuremberg" was intended to hold the clergy up to ridicule. Their occupations, and in particular the recitation of the divine office were the mark of much playful satire. Walter Lynne, who had been particularly licensed to set forth works of godliness, was especially remarkable for the number of translations of Luther's works which he issued this year (1548) from his place "by Billingsgate".

Of these translations, also, many without doubt have disappeared and those now known may also be regarded as specimens only. In considering the literature of the period account must be taken also of the original prints of the works of the foreign reformers which found their way to England¹.

Throughout the bulk of these books, originals and translations, the central point of attack is the Sacrament and the mass. This is the case whatever may have been the particular leaning of the authors, whether to the views of Luther and Melancthon or to those of Zwingli and Bullinger.

"Four principal theories" writes Hallam, "to say nothing of subordinate varieties, divided Europe at the accession of Edward VI. about the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

(1) "The church of Rome would not depart a single letter from *transubstantiation*, or the change at the moment of consecration of the substances of bread and wine into those of Christ's body and blood".

(2) "Luther, partly as it seems out of his determination to multiply differences with the church, invented a theory somewhat different, usually called *consub-*

¹ A copy of Calvin's tract. *De la cène du Seigneur*, first published in 1540, appears in the King's library catalogue of 1542, "De Cena Domini, gallice". (R. O. Aug. Off. Miscell. Bks. Vol. 160. f. 109a).

stantiation. He imagined the two substances to be united in the sacramental elements, so that they might be termed bread and wine, or the body and blood, with equal propriety. But it must be obvious that there is little more than a metaphysical distinction between this doctrine and that of Rome" ¹.

(3) "A simpler and more rational explanation occurred to Zwingli and Ecolampadius, from whom the Helvetian protestants imbibed their faith. Rejecting every notion of a real presence, and divesting the institution of all its mystery, they saw only *figurative symbols* in the elements which Christ had appointed as a commemoration of his death. But this novel opinion excited as much indignation in Luther as in the Romanists" ².

(4) "Besides these three hypotheses, a fourth was promulgated by Martin Bucer of Strasburg, a man of much acuteness, but prone to metaphysical subtlety, and not, it is said, of a very ingenuous character. Bucer, as I apprehend, though his expressions are unusually confused, did not acknowledge a local presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements after con-

¹ The ordinary Lutheran forms of administration of Communion are singularly emphatic; as for instance, "Take and eat, this is the body of Christ which is given for you". (See Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen* VIII pp. 124—5).

² In the hands of Bullinger Zwingli's doctrine was modified, but without change of its essential character, and brought into the form in which it has been adopted by the Helvetic churches. He divested it of its merely commemorative character insisting also on the presence in the communion. This change was so far developed in 1540 that Calvin expounding the doctrine could write: "Nous avons donc en quoi Luther a failli de son côté et en quoi Ecolampade et Zwingli ont failli du leur" (*Œuvres françaises recueillies par L. P. Jacob* p. 208).

secration, so far concurring with the Helvetians; while he contended that they were really, and without figure, received by the worthy communicant through faith, so as to preserve the belief of a mysterious union, and of what was sometimes called a real presence" ¹.

The reformers, however much they might differ as to the Sacrament, agreed in condemning the ancient teaching about the mass as a sacrifice and in their detestation of the "Canon" of the missal.

The opinions of both Lutherans and Helvetians on this point are fairly expressed in an "Epistle" of Bullinger, a translation of which was printed in London in 1548. "Moreover" he writes "man needs to blind himself with these words, high mass, low mass. In the high mass are the selfsame abominations which are in the lowest. In both of them is the institution and ordinance of Christ perverted; in both of them is he worshipped in the bread; in both of them are idols served; in both, specially in the service of the saints, is help asked of creatures; in both of them is the wicked Canon, the greatest portion of the mass. There is nothing in it of old antiquity, nothing of the apostolic simplicity" ².

In these years 1547 and 1548 consequently the popular mind was being stirred up by changes in old established ceremonial, by novel introductions into the services, by intemperate preaching and by profane tracts scattered broadcast over the country, attacking with scurrilous abuse what the people had hitherto been taught to regard as the Most Holy.

¹ Hallam. *Constitutional Hist.* (10th ed.) I. pp. 89—91.

² "Two Epistles of H. Bullinger, with consent of all the learned men of the church of Tyaury". London, 1548 A7.

In the midst of all this ferment it is important to know something of the mind of Cranmer on this cardinal question of the Sacrament. It must be allowed that at this period the opinion of the archbishop in matters of religion, even apart from his position as the chief ecclesiastic of the realm, was a real determining factor in events.

From the letter of Somerset to Gardiner on 28 June 1548, it is clear that the settlement of the great questions relating to the Blessed Sacrament was under the consideration of the government. "The questions and controversies" he writes "concerning the sacrament of the altar and the mass rest at the present in consultation, and with the pleasure of God shall be in small time by public doctrine and authority quietly and truly determined"¹. It is certain that Cranmer, who would have at least the chief part in the discussions and settlement, had already given up his belief in the mass as a sacrifice. That is, he had ceased to hold "that Christ is therein offered by the priest and people". In his replies to the series of questions noticed in Chapter VI he had said that the terms "oblation and sacrifice" of Christ in the mass were improperly used, and that it was only a "memory and representation" of the sacrifice of Calvary².

As to the nature of Cranmer's belief in the real presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, it is always difficult to determine with precision, at any given time, the exact phase of a mind so shifting. In this matter however there appears to have been a steady descent from the old teachings professed throughout Henry's reign. In the August of 1548,

¹ Burnet. II. 2. p. 154.

² See p. 86. *ante*.

Cranmer translated a Lutheran catechism;¹ making to the english version sundry additions of his own.

In this work in giving "the meaning and plain understanding of the words of the Lord's Supper" he declared that the Sacrament was "the true body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was ordained by Christ himself to be eaten and drunken of us Christian people under the form of bread and wine". It was not unnatural that such teaching should be unpalatable to the more advanced party, and it has been justly remarked, that it may be reconciled with the teachings of either Rome or Wittenberg. The translation itself however contains evidence that Cranmer's opinions had already, before this publication, taken a decisive turn. His attitude to the controversies of the day on the question of the Eucharist is accurately shewn in his version of a crucial passage of this Lutheran catechism.

"God is almighty", says the original. "Therefore he can do all things that He wills... *When He calls and names a thing which was not before, then at once that very thing comes into being as He names it.* Therefore when He takes bread and says: 'this is my body', then immediately there is the body of our Lord. And when He takes the chalice and says: 'this is my blood', then immediately His blood is present"².

Cranmer leaves out of his translation the words given in italics and renders the rest as follows: "wherefore when Christ takes bread and saith: 'Take, eat, this is my body', we ought not to doubt but we eat His very body; and when He takes the

¹ The german original designed for Nuremberg was translated into latin by Justus Jonas and published by him in 1539. Cranmer's english version was made from this latin translation.

² See ed. Burton p. 177 (*latin*).

cup and saith: 'Take, drink, this is my blood', we ought to think assuredly that we drink His very blood"¹.

Such a version cannot have been accidental. The two versions express the teachings of the two great schools of opinion in the sixteenth century: those who held, as it has been roughly said, the real presence and those who held the real absence. Hallam's words may again be quoted in explanation. "The truth is" he writes, "there were but two opinions at bottom as to this main point of the controversy, nor in the nature of things was it possible that there should be more. For what can be predicated concerning a body in relation to a given space, but presence and absence"²?

To speak more exactly; the one school connected the presence with the act of consecration, the other with the act of communion. And, although this was not unnaturally overlooked at the moment, Cranmer's version of the crucial passage of the catechism shows that he already belonged to the latter school of thought, not to the former. He himself also accurately marked the time of change when he said in 1551, in his answer to Gardiner: "This I confess myself, that *not long before* I wrote the said catechism I was in that error of the real presence as I was many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation &c."³.

It may well be expected that the real undercurrents of Cranmer's thought should not have been recognized at this time, and that men should have judged him by what appeared on the surface. The archbishop

¹ Ibid. p. 207 (*english*).

² *Constit. Hist.* (10th ed.) I. pp. 91—2.

³ *Works on the Lord's Supper* ed. Parker soc. p. 374

had put forth his translation of a Lutheran catechism and had withheld himself from the society of those who shared the Helvetian views. Outwardly therefore there was no ground as yet for anticipating that his conversion would have been so speedy. He was watched during all this period most narrowly both by the english and foreign reformers, who constantly and minutely reported the attitude of his mind to their foreign masters. But, their very anxiety was calculated to prevent their forming an accurate estimate of the archbishop's real opinions.

"You must know" writes Bartholomew Traheron to Bullinger, on 1 August 1548, "that all our countrymen who are sincerely favourable to the restoration of truth entertain in all respects like opinions with you (*i.e.* Helvetian). I except the archbishop of Canterbury and Latimer and a very few learned men besides; for from among the nobility I know not one whose opinions are otherwise than what they ought to be. As to Canterbury, he conducts himself in such a way, I know not how, as that the people do not think much of him and the nobility regard him as lukewarm. In other respects he is a kind and good natured man"¹.

¹ *Orig. Letters.* Park. Soc. p. 320. The writer then goes on to say "as to Latimer, though he does not clearly understand the true doctrine of the Eucharist, he is nevertheless more favourable than either Luther or even Bucer. I am quite sure that he will never be a hindrance to the cause. For, being a man of admirable talent, he sees more clearly into the subject than others and is desirous to come into our sentiments, but is slow to decide, and cannot without much difficulty, and even timidity, renounce an opinion, which he has once imbibed. But there is good hope that he will some time or other come over to our side altogether. For he is so far from avoiding any of our friends that he rather seeks their company" &c.

John ab Ulmis, the Oxford student, also writes to his master Bullinger on 18 August 1548, from London where he had come to introduce himself to the favourable notice of the archbishop. "After I had written this very short letter", he says, "lo! your letter was delivered to the archbishop of Canterbury, which I fully understand from master Peter Martyr that you had written to him with the greatest courtesy and respect. The first part, if I remember right, was a grave and learned admonition to his episcopal duties; the remainder was a subtle transition to the Eucharist. But, to tell you all in a few words; although your letter (for it was constantly being copied) afforded pleasure to every one, and to the bishop himself a full and gratifying exhortation to his duty, yet I would have you know this for certain, that this Thomas has fallen into so heavy a slumber, that we entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter. For lately he has published a catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the papists in the holy supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous and lucid"¹.

Before the close of the year 1548, however, Bullinger and his disciples had reason to congratulate themselves that the favourable turn in Cranmer's opinions was patent to all the world.

¹ Ibid. pp. 380—1. Ab Ulmis to Bullinger 18 Aug. 1548

CHAPTER IX.

THE NEW LITURGY; TIME, PLACE, AND PERSONS CONCERNED IN IT.

The autumn of 1548 was marked by a great mortality: London was visited by the pestilence. As early as 19 August the French ambassador had found it necessary to remove to Streatham to avoid the danger ¹. But the work on the new liturgy which had now to be undertaken could be as well pursued in the country as in London. The new form of public prayer to supersede the old traditional services was to be ready to receive the approval of Parliament in its meeting at the close of the year.

Before describing what took place when the government measure for Common Prayer was brought before the Lords at Westminster, it will be useful to enquire into what is known as to the circumstances under which the book was composed. In itself, it may be of little importance to determine exactly when or where the work was compiled, or who probably had the chief hand in the matter; but the variety of statements as to time, place and persons, makes it at least desirable to fix the limits

¹ *Inventaire* &c. p. 436.

of certain knowledge and to enquire what is established by evidence and what is mere conjecture. As a matter of fact definite statements are constantly made in regard to this matter, which, upon examination, will be found to have no surer basis than the guesses and imaginings of their authors. In this chapter therefore it is proposed, first to give the history of the various statements commonly made as to the compilation of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI; and next to state, so far as is possible, what can really be ascertained as certainly known upon authentic evidence.

In the letter to the bishops of 13 March 1548, in which the Council ordered the new rite of communion, there is expressed the belief that this addition to the ancient mass would not be willingly received by a large portion of the clergy. And "considering furthermore" the letter proceeds, "that a great number of the curates of the realm either for lack of knowledge cannot, or for want of good mind will not, be so ready to set forth the same as we would wish," provisions to meet the immediate difficulty are consequently made.

The result corresponded to the anticipation of the Council. Foxe, who must have been an eyewitness of what really happened, states that "through the perverse obstinacy and dissembling frowardness of many of the inferior priests and ministers of the cathedrals and other churches of this realm, there did arise a marvellous schism and variety of fashions in celebrating the common service and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the church. For some, zealously allowing the king's proceedings, did gladly follow the order thereof; and others, though not so willingly admitting them did yet dissemblingly and patchingly use some part

of them; but many, carelessly contemning all, would still exercise their old wonted popery" ¹.

The government subsequently stated that they had "abstained from punishing those that had offended" by failing to comply with their orders as to the new rite of communion; but had resolved to meet the difficulty by the imposition "of a uniform, quiet and godly order, rite and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the sacraments" ². These then are the reasons which determined the rulers to impose the new liturgy, as explained by the authors of the measure itself.

In regard to the persons who actually prepared the new book, the Act of Uniformity states that the king's highness, by the advice of Somerset and the rest of the Council, "appointed the archbishop of Canterbury and certain of the most learned and discreet bishops and other learned men of this realm" to draw it up. Their instructions were, according to the authority of the act, "to have as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by scripture as to the usages in the primitive church" ³.

In his diary the king gives another item of information. Under the second year of his reign he writes that "an uniform order of prayer was institute, before made by a number of bishops and learned men gathered together in Windsor" ⁴.

Archbishop Cranmer in the last days of his life,

¹ Foxe (ed. Townsend) V. p. 720.

² Act of Uniformity. 2 and 3 Ed. VI c. 1.

³ Ibid. cf. "Sincerely set forth according to the Scriptures and the use of the primitive church". King and Council to Bonner 23 July 1549. (Foxe. ed. Townsend V. p. 726.)

⁴ Burnet. II. 2. p. 6.

writing to Queen Mary in September 1555, says: "when a good number of the best learned men reputed within this realm, some favouring the old, some the new learning, as they term it (where indeed that which they call the old is the new and that which they call the new is the old); but when a great number of such learned men of both sorts were gathered together at Windsor for the reformation of the service of the church, it was agreed by both, without controversy (not one saying contrary), that the service of the church ought to be in the mother tongue" ¹.

The anonymous 'life and death of archbishop Cranmer', certainly drawn up before 1559, states in regard to the first Prayer Book, that Edward "by the inciting of the foresaid archbishop and the advice of the Duke of Somerset, and the consent of the whole Council, established by act of parliament so good and perfect a book of religion and agreeable to God's word (without dispraise of other be it spoken) as ever was used since the apostolic times" ².

Foxe, the next writer who deals with this question and a contemporary of the event, simply copies the information, and even the words, of the act of Parliament on the matter. He has apparently no further knowledge than what was given to the country by the government in the preamble of the bill for Uniformity.

¹ *Remains*. Parker Soc. p. 450.

The opinions expressed by the bishops in the early part of 1548 on the question of vernacular service have already been noticed in considering their replies to the series of questions on the mass (p. 88 *ante*). It will be remembered that they were by no means all in favour of this innovation.

² *Narratives of the Reformation*. Camd. Soc. p. 225.

No list of the "bishops and other learned men," thus said to have compiled the book, appears to have been given until the publication of Fuller's Church History in the year 1657, more than a century later. This author, as will be seen in the following passages, commences his account by confusing the 'Order of Communion' (1548) and the first Prayer Book of the following year (1549). "But under his son king Edward VI." he writes, "a new form of divine worship was set forth in the vulgar tongue which passed a three-fold purgation (viz. in 1549, 1552, 1559). The first edition of the liturgy or Common Prayer, in the first year of king Edward VI, was recommended to the care of the most grave bishops and others, (assembled by the king at his castle at Windsor) and when by them completed, set forth in print, 1548, with a proclamation in the king's name to give authority thereunto: being also recommended unto every bishop by especial letters from the lords of the Council" (see the form of them in Foxe II, 661) "to see the same put in execution. And in the next year a penalty was imposed by Act of Parliament on such who should deprave or neglect the use thereof". It will be observed that nearly all the details here given relate to the order of communion issued in 1548. Under this doubtful and confused heading Fuller for the first time gives a list of the compilers of the liturgy. These he states are: the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Ely, Rochester, Lincoln, Westminster, Hereford and Chichester, and the doctors May, Cox, Taylor, Haines, Robertson and Redman; in all, Cranmer with twelve others.

Heylyn, in his *Ecclesia Vindicata* published the same year (1657), writes: "where let me tell you, by the way, that the men who were employed in the weighty business (of drawing up the first Prayer

Book) were Cranmer and the above-named twelve bishops and doctors" ¹.

The same writer, in his *Ecclesia Restaurata* published in 1664, somewhat varies the version he gave in his previous work. He writes in reference to "the godly bishops and religious men" engaged on the Order of Communion: these "convened together (if at the least they were the same which made the first liturgy of this king's time, as I think they were) were those who follow:" — He then gives the names of Cranmer and his twelve associates ².

A few pages further on the author states positively that the persons, to whom the framing of the Prayer Book of 1549 was committed, were "the godly bishops and other learned divines... formerly employed in drawing up the order for Holy Communion".

In 1679 Burnet gave a very full and entirely new list of the compilers of the Order of Communion. It was composed of the names of all the bishops and divines to whom the 'questions' relating to the mass had been submitted ³, to which he added those of Thirlby, bishop of Westminster and doctors May, Haines, Robertson and Redman, evidently obtained without acknowledgment from the list given by Fuller. In regard to the Prayer Book, he states

¹ p. 30. Heylyn's authority was evidently Fuller's History published in the same year although he does not say so. For, this part of the *Ecclesia Vindicata* is only a reprint of his tract. "*Parliament's powers in laws for religion*" which Heylyn published in 1645 and which does not contain the passage "where let me tell you" &c quoted above. In regard to the order of communion he keeps to the words of Foxe, that "it was the care of the most grave and learned bishops and others assembled by the king at his castle of Windsor".

² I. pp. 57—8.

³ See p. 138 *ante*.

summarily, that it was the work of "those selected bishops and divines who had laboured in the setting forth of the office of the Communion". The elements of confusion being now fully present it remains to state briefly the various combinations and conjectures for which they provided material.

Strype in his 'life of Cranmer' published in 1694, simply states that the commissioners for drawing up the Order of Communion "were most of the bishops and several others of the most learned divines of the nation" together with archbishop Cranmer¹. For the authors of the first Prayer Book he assigns "the same bishops and divines as it seems;"² and having said so much, he proceeds soon after to repeat the general words of the Act of Uniformity about the compilers, adding: "but the rest of them, if we may give credit to Fuller's Church History, and what is commonly taken up and reported in our histories, were" Cranmer and the above-named twelve; "though I conjecture the main of the work went through some few of these men's hands, for three of those bishops, Thirlby, Skip and Day, protested against the bill for this liturgy when it passed their house, and I believe Robertson and Redman liked it as little"³.

Next in order of time comes the church historian Collier. He gives the following account of the compilation of the Communion Book: "In the latter end of this winter, 1547, a committee of divines were commanded by the king to draw up an order for administering the Holy Eucharist in english under both kinds... The commission was directed to the archbishop of Canterbury and" the twelve divines

¹ p. 159. Cf. *Eccl. Mem.* II. p. 85.

² *Eccl. Mem.* II. 355.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 85—6.

mentioned by Fuller. "These were the persons who afterwards made the first Liturgy, and therefore Heylyn is of opinion that they were now employed for the business above mentioned. The learned bishop, Burnet from a MS. of Dr. Stillingfleet gives a different list, on which we ought rather to rely, for Heylyn speaks only upon conjecture"¹. Collier then gives the names of the four and twenty first suggested by Burnet. As to the Prayer Book (1549) he merely states that "the committee of bishops and divines above mentioned" were entrusted with the work². But as to which of the lists he here refers to, whether the twelve or the twenty four, he leaves the reader of his book to determine for himself.

Soames adopts Fuller's list, but follows out Strype's hint as to the book probably passing through few hands; and in view of the statement of the Act of Uniformity that it was "concluded with one uniform agreement" of the compilers, considers that Cranmer, Goodrich, Holbeach and Ridley among the bishops, and May, Taylor, Haines and Cox among the divines, completed the task, the rest withdrawing³.

A recent writer of authority states categorically in regard to the Order of Communion, that "the work was entrusted to a committee of twenty four persons, and that committee was composed entirely and exclusively of members of the Convocations of

¹ *History* II. 243.

² II. p. 252.

³ Soames. *Reformation* III. p. 356. "That the prelates... so characterized (as the most learned and discreet) were Ridley, Goodrich and Holbeach, is highly probable, both because they have been long placed among our illustrious liturgy compilers and because they professed principles purely scriptural. (p. 354).

Canterbury and York, an important fact which has generally been overlooked". For this statement he refers his readers to Collier.

In speaking of the Prayer Book of 1549, he says: "a body of divines was now selected and fortified by royal authority for the purpose (of compiling the first Prayer Book of Edward VI). This was a smaller committee than that which had just settled the Order of Communion. That committee consisted of 24 persons as above stated and was composed of members of both Convocations. The committee now under consideration consisted of 13 persons only and was selected solely from the Convocation of Canterbury. But on comparison of the two lists given, it will be seen that all those engaged in the second committee had served on the first. The names of the second committee for compiling a reformed Prayer Book are as follows": Cranmer and the twelve associates mentioned by Fuller ¹.

The question of time and place has fortunately not been so much obscured by subsequent additions to the story. Foxe, although he mentions "the king's castle of Windsor" as the place where the compilers of the Order of Communion assembled, does not assign any place for "the most godly and learned conferences" upon the first Prayer Book (1549). The king's diary however states that the bishops and others "were gathered together in Windsor" and this statement has been generally accepted.

Heylyn, more than a century after the event, was the first to assign a date for the formal commencement of the work. His assertion is that Edward caused the bishops and divines intrusted with the compilation "to attend his pleasure on the 1st day

¹ Joyce, *Acts of the church* (1531-1885) p. 115.

of September" (1548) ¹. Strype declares that the committee of bishops and others "met in May 1548." But, for both these statements no authority is given and subsequent writers have made their choice between them, or combined them as best suited their purpose.

It now remains to be seen what can be ascertained in regard to these matters from contemporary documents. First, as to the place of assembly, the king can hardly be mistaken and some meeting must have taken place at Windsor. The Grey Friars' chronicle, however, after referring to the proclamation of 23 September (1548) inhibiting all preaching until "such time as the Council had determined such things as were in hand withal", continues: "for at that time divers of the bishops sat at Chertsey abbey for some time ² for divers matters of the king and Council" ³. Odet de Selve, the french ambassador writing from Streatham to his sovereign on 30 September 1548 concludes that he has no more news for the moment "except that there are daily fights in the London churches and elsewhere in the kingdom, whether there shall be mass or not" ⁴. To make some settlement a certain number of bishops and doctors are gathered at a place near the court called Chertsey ⁵, where they are to determine what is to be

¹ *Eccl. Restaurata*. I. p. 64.

² The clause "for some time" is not in the Camden Soc. edition, but appears in the Rolls edition (*monum. Francisc.* II, 217).

³ ed. Camd. Soc. p. 56.

⁴ *Grey Friar's chronicle* writes almost in the same terms at this period: "also at that time was many battles made of divers parties against the Blessed Sacrament one against another". (Ibid p. 57).

⁵ This is written as Chetsey and interpreted by the editor, Chelsea; but it is more probable, especially in view of the Grey Friars'

held in this kingdom about the mass and the Sacrament of the altar"¹. It seems clear therefore that although the persons engaged on the compilation of the new Prayer Book had an interview with the king at Windsor, they also held sittings at Chertsey.

In the early days of this month an assembly was certainly held in Chertsey for another purpose. On the 9th of September 1548 Ferrar was there consecrated bishop of St. Davids by Cranmer, assisted by Holbeach of Lincoln and Ridley of Rochester. The other persons specially mentioned as being present at this service, and communicating, are Thirlby, bishop of Westminster, and doctors May, Haynes, Robertson and Redman. The resemblance to the list given by Fuller is striking². In regard to Windsor it may also be observed that in the later days of October Coverdale was staying at the castle with Cranmer³.

chronicle that Chertsey is meant. Chelsea at this time of plague would be too near London and certainly not near the court, which was then at Oatlands within two or three miles of Chertsey abbey.

¹ *Inventaire* &c. p. 453.

² Stubbs. *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* p. 80. Strype (*Cranmer*, pp. 183—4) gives an account of the ceremony. The original Act, from Cranmer's Register, first printed by Courayer, is reprinted in Estcourt's *Question of Anglican Ordinations*, App. pp. xxvii—viii. Strype omits some details of importance: (1) the consecration was preceded "communibus suffragiis de more ecclesiae Anglicanae". Canon Estcourt (p. 55) is doubtless right in thinking this "may refer to the litany which was ordered by the king's injunctions the year before" as a substitute for the procession (see p. 54 *ante*); (2) the "holy Eucharist was consecrated," as well as administered, by Cranmer "in the vulgar tongue".

³ *Orig. Letters*. p. 32. Coverdale to Paul Fagius. "From the king's castle which we call Windsor", 21 Oct. 1548. "I also showed your letter yesterday to the most Revd. archbishop of

If, as Heylyn states, those engaged on the book were received by the king at Windsor before commencing their work, it seems improbable that this reception could have taken place on 1 September. On that day Edward was at his house at Oatlands and Somerset at Syon. On the 22nd and 23rd of September, however, the Privy Seals show that the king was at Windsor, and these are the only days on which the court is known certainly to have been there during the months of July, August and September¹. It is moreover noteworthy that on the second day of the king's stay at the castle (23 September) the proclamation was issued notifying that the king was determined to see very shortly one uniform order (of divine service) throughout this his realm, and to put an end to all controversies in religion, so far as God should give grace, for which cause at this time certain bishops and notable learned men, by his highness' command, are congregate"². This is the first public intimation that what Somerset had foreshadowed in his letter to Gardiner (28 June) was being brought to effect, and that the compilation of a new liturgy was actually in hand.

It may be concluded therefore with much probability that the work was formally inaugurated on the 22nd or 23rd of September 1548.

Canterbury, who, as he has undertaken to educate your dear son (whom he has just sent away to Canterbury by reason of the plague that is raging at this place) both in religion and learning at his own expense, in like manner reflecting upon the lamentable condition of your churches, he truly sympathizes in your misfortune wherefore he desired you most especially to come over to us".

¹ De Selve *Inventaire &c.* p. 451 also notes this stay at Windsor.

² Wilkins IV. 30.

The question in regard to persons is not hard to decide. All that is known for certain is that Cranmer was one of those who compiled the book. On a review of the detailed statements made as to the persons engaged in the work it will appear that they are all based on the statements of either Burnet or Fuller. Burnet's list of twenty-four bishops and doctors is a purely arbitrary composition and need not be seriously considered. There remains only the list of Fuller. This he cannot be believed to have invented, and it certainly agrees closely with the list of persons known to be assembled at Chertsey early in September. But as he himself clearly did not know to what the list really referred, it is practically useless for determining the actual names of the compilers of the First Book of Common Prayer, and must remain without authority until the document itself can be produced¹.

The silence of Foxe on the subject is more than significant. When the debate in Parliament, which preceded the introduction of the Prayer Book, comes to be considered it will be seen that Somerset intended that as little as possible should be publicly known concerning the history of the composition of this new liturgy.

A document of some interest, proceeding from Somerset himself, still remains to be noticed. On the 4th of September 1548, he wrote "from Syon", "to our loving friend our Vice-chancellor of Cambridge and to all masters and rulers of colleges there".

¹ Search has been made for any sign of a commission for either the Order of Communion or the book of Common Prayer, through every series of documents and collection of papers, which seemed to promise results; but in vain; no indication of any such commission has been met with.

“After our right hearty commendations. For so much as upon divers orders in the rites and ceremonies of the church, there might peradventure some dissension or disorder rise amongst you in the university, to the evil example of other, we have thought good to advertise you, and in the king’s Majesty’s behalf to will and command you that until such time as an order be taken and prescribed by his Highness to be universally kept throughout the whole realm, or by visitors of his Highness appointed unto you particularly, that you and every of you in your colleges, chapels or other churches use one uniform order, rite, and ceremonies in the mass, matins and even-song and all divine service in the same to be said or sung, such as is presently used in the king’s Majesty’s chapel, and none other. The which for more instruction we have by this bearer sent unto you. Thus fare you well”¹.

From this letter it appears (1) that yet a further step had been taken in the royal chapel and that the service celebrated there consisted of three parts: the mass, matins and even-song. It may be gathered, that the compline in english had disappeared. (2) This service must have differed from the mass, matins and vespers contained in the ancient books, since it was necessary that copies should be sent for the guidance of those who were required to observe it. (3) The new order prescribed ceremonies which were different from those hitherto in use. (4) It is clear that before September 1548, services were already drawn up and in use, the main parts of which corresponded with those subsequently enforced in the first Book of Common Prayer.

¹ The original is in C. C. C. MS. 106 f. 495: it is printed in Cooper’s *Annals of Cambridge*, II. p. 18.

CHAPTER X.

CONVOCAATION AND THE PRAYER BOOK.

A recent work of some authority, dealing professedly with the acts of the Church (1531—1885) states: "the fact, that the (First Prayer) Book was formally and synodically sanctioned, can be positively proved by evidence, and that indisputable"¹. Such synodical sanction must have been given, if at all, sometime between 24 November 1548, the day on which parliament met, and 14 March 1549, when it was prorogued. On the other hand, the recent historian of the Church of England, Canon Dixon, affirms that "the Convocations of the clergy had nothing to do with the first Act of Uniformity of religion. Laymen made the first english Book of Common Prayer into a schedule of a penal statute. As little in the work itself, which was then imposed on the realm, had the clergy originally any share"².

In the face of such contradictory statements it is impossible here to avoid a brief enquiry into the facts of the case so far as they can be ascertained.

Wilkins' *Concilia* contains nothing about any meeting of the Convocation of clergy in the year 1548—9. From the brief abstract given in his volume of the king's writs of prorogation, it would appear that

¹ Joyce, *Acts of the Church*. p. 117.

² *History* &c. III, p. 5.

it did not meet from 26 December 1547, until 24 January 1552. One document, however, which is there cited as a prorogation *sine die*, hardly seems on examination of Cranmer's register to bear this interpretation. It is difficult to say what this writ, dated 21 April 1548, really means. It is possible that the registrar has made some omission in copying the document into the book; but as it stands the sense is accurately expressed in a note of White Kennett: "the said Convocation was further prorogued, to what day is not signified in the royal writ"¹. Wake's interpretation of the doubtful document is, that the meeting was prorogued "to such other time as the archbishop should appoint"². This does not appear from the writ itself, and from the document which immediately follows, it seems more probable that Convocation had actually met in the winter of 1548-9³. Moreover parliament at this time passed an act, confirming a subsidy granted by the clergy to the king, and although it must not necessarily be concluded that the grant was made in Convocation at this date, it appears more probable that this was so.

Granting therefore that the Convocation of clergy of the province of Canterbury met at the same time as parliament (November 1548) what did it do? Wake writes as follows: "What our Convocations did" whilst parliament was sitting "more than granting

¹ Lansd. MS. 1031 f. 30, Eadem Convocatio prorogata ulterius (dies non significatur in brevi regis).

² *State of the Church* p. 494. He also says that the Convocation of York was prorogued evidently about 20 April (1548) to 6 October "after which we hear no more of it till its *dissolution*".

³ This is a prorogation from 15 March 1549, the day after the prorogation of Parliament to 4 November of the same year. In it is the phrase "*Convocatio cleri . . . jam modo tenta et instans existit*".

of a subsidy I cannot tell; most probable it is, that they only met and were continued (*i.e.* adjourned) from time to time by the archbishops whilst parliament sat, as I find that of our province (of York) was, by order of the king's writ at the end of it"¹.

It is unfortunately true that the records of the Convocation of Canterbury were burnt in the great fire of London (1666); but it does not follow that their contents are unknown. The assertion, that almost as much is known of them for the reign of Edward VI, as if they had actually survived, would hardly be an exaggeration. Many years before their destruction these records were examined by both Heylyn and Fuller. The former was at the time of his researches clerk of the Convocation and had the custody of the archives. He was moreover then actually engaged in gathering his materials for the history of the Reformation, and to his collections then made is practically due all present knowledge of many of the acts of Convocation from 1529². For the reign of Edward VI, moreover, he is careful to describe in his history the actual state of the records as he saw them, and his account is borne out by the independent testimony of Fuller³.

¹ *State of the church.* p. 495.

² This is true with the exception of the acts of 1547 (see pp. 75—6 *ante* and Appendix VII.). Wilkins saw Heylyn's volume of excerpts, and the records of Convocation which he prints for the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary are almost entirely derived from Heylyn's MSS, although in three or four instances he does not give the authority. The MSS. Wilkins used can hardly have been destroyed since his time and should be forthcoming.

³ It is evident from his writings that Heylyn never saw the acts of the Convocation of 1547; these had disappeared from the archives before his time. They had been already collected with many other valuable contemporary documents by archbishop Parker.

Further than this; Heylyn's attention was specially called in the year 1644 to the question of the synodical approval of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. He was in correspondence with a writer, who had objected that the established religion of England was only parliamentary, imposed by the authority of the Lords and Commons, and without the express approval of the clergy in Convocation. Heylyn at first replied that the liturgy was the work of the Church, and "that the two houses of parliament did nothing in the present business but impose that upon the people, which the learned and religious clergy, whom the king appointed thereunto, were agreed upon"¹.

His friend was not satisfied, and still doubted whether the manner of proceeding "was so regular as it might have been. And this," Heylyn added in his reply, "you stumble at the rather in regard that the whole body of the clergy in their Convocations had no hand therein, either as to *decree* the doing of it or to *approve* it being done". He thereupon discusses this objection at considerable length. He takes it for granted, having at the time complete access to the records of the Convocation, that the fact is as objected, and that Convocation really had no hand in the framing or approval of the Book of Common Prayer. He however meets the objection by an affirmative answer to the following question: "Whether the king (for his acting by a protector does not change the case) consulting with a lesser part of his bishops and clergy and having their consent therein may conclude anything in the way of (practical) reformation, the residue and greater part not advised withal nor yielding their consent unto it in a formal way"².

¹ *Ecclesia Vindicata*. pp. 29—30.

² See the whole argument in *Ecclesia Vindicata*. pp. 79—84.

The first statement of any ecclesiastical historian tending towards the definite assertion that Convocation actually approved the first Prayer Book, is that of Strype in 1723, who certainly says that, "what they (the learned divines) had concluded upon was offered the Convocation and, after all this, the parliament approved"¹.

It may be taken as certain therefore that the Convocation registers contained no record, either of any appointment of divines to compile the new liturgy, or of any approval of it after it was drawn up, whether before or after the parliamentary sanction.

Certain contemporary evidence, however, has been adduced as positive proof of this synodical approval, the value of which has also to be considered.

(1) The king's letter to Bonner, dated 23 July 1549, asserts that the book "hath been and is most godly set forth not only by the common agreement and full assent of the nobility and commons of the late session of our late parliament, but also by the like assent of the bishops in the same parliament and

This part of the work was first printed in 1645 under the title "*Parliament's powers in laws for religion*" and republished in 1653 as the "*Way of Reformation of the Church of England*".

¹ *Eccl. Mem.* II. p. 87. The Catholic controversialists whom Strype stigmatizes, such as Dr. Hill and Dr. Bristowe must be allowed to accept the responsibility for raising the debates on this subject. The testimony of Bancroft and Abbot does not seem to be of any real weight in the discussion. Bancroft's impression moreover was that the Communion Book of 1548, not the Prayer Book of 1549, was carefully compiled and confirmed by a Synod (see the passage of his sermon reprinted in the *Miscellany of the Wodrow Soc.* vol. I. p. 480). Readers of the sermon, acquainted with the facts, will probably be of opinion that Bancroft had no knowledge of what took place apart from books still accessible.

of all other the learned men of this realm in their synods and Convocations provincial”¹.

(2) The answer made to the men of Devon and Cornwall drawn up in the king’s name about the same date has almost the same words.

(3) About 24 June 1549, the Council gave certain instructions to Dr. Hopton, chaplain to the princess Mary, in regard to her persistency in having mass still said in her chapel. In reply to the observation of the princess, that the law made by parliament is not worthy of the name of law, he is told to reply, that she is “wrong to disallow a law of the king made after long study, true disputation, and uniform determination of the whole clergy consulted, debated and concluded”².

(4) Further, a letter from Edward to his sister Mary, undated, but apparently about the same time, states: “we have, by the advice of our dearest uncle Edward Duke of Somerset &c. and the rest of our Privy Council, with one full and whole consent, both of our clergy in their several Synods and Convocations, and also of the noblemen and commons in the late session of our parliament, established by authority of our said parliament one godly and uniform order of common prayer”³.

The above is all the contemporary evidence adduced to prove the sanction of Convocation to the new Prayer Book. It will be observed that the documents quoted were issued at a period when the

¹ Foxe, V. p. 126.

² Ibid. VI. p. 8.

³ R. O. State Papers. Domestic. Ed. VI. Vol. IX. No. 51. Cf. also a subsequent clause in the same letter: “forasmuch as the premisses have been foreseen, considered, debated and set forth with one agreement of all the state of our realm, and by the authority of our said Parliament as aforesaid”.

opposition of the country to the introduction of the liturgy had already made itself felt, and when accordingly it was necessary to support the measure with all the authority possible. On examining these passages closely — a process not unnecessary in a period marked by so many doubtful dealings on the part of the rulers — it will be seen that the assent of the bishops to the Book is limited, to such as was given “in the said parliament”. This was written to bishop Bonner, who knew the circumstances; but to Mary, the king states that the liturgy had received the “consent of our clergy in their *several* Synods and Convocations provincial”. If any definite and exact meaning is to be attached to this at all, it must apply to the province of York as well as to that of Canterbury. It would indeed be more than singular if all traces of so important an Act should have disappeared from the records of both provinces. For here Wake’s statement may be recalled, so far as York is concerned, that this Convocation was only adjourned from time to time whilst the parliament sat; in other words, that it never assembled for business at all.

The only substantial point, upon which the belief that such approval was in fact given or asked can be based, is the king’s letter to Bonner. It may be fairly urged that Edward writing to one who was cognizant of the actual facts of the case would not have thought of making such a statement, even in its guarded form, if it were not true. It will be recollected however that so far as the assent of the bishops is concerned, this is limited to what was given in the parliament. Even here it is quite certain that so far from this assent having been given by all the bishops, practically as many voted against the measure as for it.

The general statements therefore contained in the passages before cited can hardly be taken as sufficient warrant for accepting as fact what is otherwise doubtful. The whole matter has the appearance of being an after-thought. The need of obtaining any approval of the clergy to measures contemplated by the king and Council does not appear to have been considered, and the suggestion is not made, until it became of importance to win acceptance for the new liturgy, and overcome popular opposition by investing it with all the authority possible.

The Act of Uniformity, which carefully details all the steps taken in the matter, and is in fact the sole authority on the subject, nowhere pretends or hints that the Convocation had any part in the business. Cheek, the king's tutor, moreover, in his reply to the men of Devon and Cornwall, asks "why should ye not like that which God's word established, the primitive Church hath authorized, the greatest learned men of this realm hath drawn, the whole consent of the parliament hath confirmed, the king's Majesty hath set forth? Ye think it is not learnedly done. Dare ye commons take upon you more learning than the chosen bishops and clerks of this realm have? Ye were wont to judge your parliament wisest, and now will ye suddenly excel them in wisdom? Or can ye think it lacketh authority, which the king, the learned and wisest have approved"¹? If there had been any ecclesiastical sanction it is not unreasonable to suppose that Sir John Cheek would have here stated it².

¹ "*The hurt of sedition*" (2nd ed. 1569). Bi.

² The passage already cited from Cranmer's letter to Queen Mary (Sept. 1555) has a bearing on this point. It is at least as remarkable for what it does not say as for what it says. In the

On looking therefore merely at the passages adduced for the approval of the Book of Common Prayer by Convocation, they might at first sight seem sufficient to bear out the assertion. But on taking a survey of the entire circumstances, and bearing in mind the attitude of Cranmer to the Convocation at its last meeting, there can remain very little doubt that the book was never submitted to Convocation at all¹.

In the next chapter, however, it will appear that for the general and vague statements of an approval there was at least some pretext. It is now certain that the proposed liturgy was submitted to a meeting of the bishops, apparently in the month of October, with a view to obtain their general assent to the intended government measure, and thus insure its speedy passage through parliament. This meeting however of the bishops, although in a contemporary letter² it is called a synod, can have no pretension to be a formal assembly of the clergy.

The success which attended the measure in parliament will appear in the next chapter.

circumstances of his peril, it would be natural to suppose that, if it had been possible he would have cited the synodical approval by the English church of "the reformation of the service", in preference to the "good number of the best learned men reputed within this realm".

¹ See p. 181 *post*.

² John Burcher at Strasburg to Bullinger (see p. 178 *post*).

CHAPTER XI.

THE DEBATE ON THE SACRAMENT IN THE PARLIAMENT OF 1548—9.

The opening of the second session of parliament was fixed for the end of November 1548. The french ambassador writing from London on the 26th of the month says: "Sire: the king of England arrived here yesterday, where are also all the chief nobles, bishops and gentlemen of this kingdom for the estates, which they call parliament, which is immediately to assemble at Westminster, chiefly for the purpose, as it is believed, of effecting some settlement in the matter of religion upon which there is a wonderful discord of opinion and practice, especially in regard to the Sacrament of the altar and the mass. It may also be expected that the way to raise money from the people will be discussed, for there are grave reasons for thinking that the king is not too well provided"¹.

On 1 December, de Selve again reports, that "the parliament began here on Tuesday last, the 27th of November. The king of England was not present in person because it is only a continuation of that which commenced last year"².

¹ *Inventaire &c.* p. 473.

² *Ibid.* p. 475.

No ecclesiastical business was undertaken during the first fortnight; but the course of proceedings in this pressing matter had already been determined upon. The introduction of a bill, imposing the new Prayer Book on the church, was to be preceded by a discussion on the doctrine of the Sacrament.

Among the Royal collection of manuscripts, in the British Museum is a small tract, hitherto apparently unnoticed, which seems not unlikely to have been connected with the preparations for this discussion. It is entitled "*Of the Sacrament of Thanksgiving: a short treatise of Peter Martyr's making*". To the tract is prefixed a letter dedicating the translation to "the Right Hon: the Lord Protector's Grace", and dated from Westminster the 1st day of December, which can only have been in this year, 1548². This dedication commences by declaring "that there are many and divers controversies about the Sacrament of Thanksgiving, which do occupy men's heads wonderfully, and for the greatness of the matter seem worthy debatement". The writer then proceeds to remind Somerset that he "had so long season before coming to the height of this honour, not only favoured, but also furthered the truth of God and his glory in most dangerous times. Wherefore you knowing the true cause of honour and receiving the effect thereof, do now most praiseworthily and like

¹ B. Mus. Royal. MS. 17C. V.

² On 1 December 1547 the tract would have been premature, because matters were not yet so far advanced, and on 1 December 1549 not only would the tract have been out of date, but Somerset was no longer the Protector. There is nothing to show who translated it; but the conjecture may be hazarded that it was Turner, Somerset's chaplain, and one who was at the time very active with his pen against the mass.

God's true officer, by calling the learned and well minded men together, encrease and enlarge the true worship". Hence this treatise is offered "to your Excellency, thinking it both worthy your grace's reading and also fit that excellent truths should be defended by excellent magistrates"¹. The translator commences by summing up the conclusions of Martyr's tract in a practical form such as the busy statesman might easily master.

They are the following: (1) "Christ is in the Holy Supper to them that do come to his table, and he doth verily feed the faithful with his body and blood". (2) There is no transubstantiation. (3) There is no intermixture of the natures or substances of bread and wine and body and blood. (4) But they are so united that as often as the one is faithfully received the other also is. (5) "The presence of Christ... doth belong more nighly and properly to the receivers than to the tokens" that is "of those receivers that do rightly and faithfully come to the communion". (6) "The presence of Christ... is not at any time, but in the use of the supper". (7) Only the good receive "the body and blood", the wicked "receive nothing but the tokens of bread and wine". (8) When the Sacrament is received, "the faithful" ought to worship "in their mind Christ himself and not the tokens". (9) "The residue of this Sacrament, after the communion is done, ought not to be kept as we see it used now in popish churches".

It will be subsequently seen, that these conclusions cover the ground taken up by Cranmer and his followers in the debate on the Sacrament at the Parliament house, and it would appear more than probable that this manuscript was actually designed

¹ ff. 1—6.

for Somerset's help and guidance in the management of the business.

The burning question was approached for the first time in the House of Lords on Friday 14 December 1548, and the disputation extended over some days. Three laymen only spoke in the discussion but the parts were carefully assigned to each. Somerset assumed, as moderator, a calmness and dignity which was only once disturbed by a sudden gust of passion; Warwick, afterwards the duke of Northumberland, undertook the task of hectoring and threatening those in opposition to the government measure; whilst Smythe, the secretary of State, freely interrupted the course of argument with speeches and remarks generally verging on vulgar profanity. The commons it is said crowded into the chamber of the upper house "to hear these sharp and fervent disputations"¹.

On the first evening (Friday 14 December) the proposed new Book of service was apparently read by secretary Smythe and some irregular discussion took place,² but the disputation was regarded as beginning on the morning of the following day, Saturday the 15th December.³ On the meeting of the

¹ *Orig. Letters*, Parker Soc. p. 469.

² Royal MS. 17 B. XXXIX. ff. 5a and 1b. The account of the debate in the House of Lords given in this chapter is taken from this important MS. hitherto unknown. The whole document will be found in the Appendix. It is probably the first systematic account of any debate of Parliament. Traheron writing to Bullinger on the 31st says: "on the 14th of December if I mistake not a disputation was held at London concerning the Eucharist in the presence of almost all the nobility of England &c". (*Orig. Letters* pp. 322—3.)

³ On each day, according to the Lords' Journals, the House met at ten o'clock in the morning. The bishop of Coventry and Lich-

house the Protector, to bring the proceedings into some order, commanded the bishops "to fall to some point (and) willed them to dispute whether bread be in the Sacrament after the consecration or not".

Tunstall, the bishop of Durham, upon whom the burden of the dispute on the side of Catholic doctrine fell on the first day, was unwilling that so important a discussion should be confined within the narrow limits of Somerset's proposition. He was proceeding to treat of the mass generally when the Protector interrupted and insisted upon the course he had prescribed being strictly followed.

The bishop was unwilling to give way, and pointed out that "the adoration was left out of the Book," because those who had compiled it believed that "there is nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine;" and yet he, Tunstall, firmly "believed that there is the very body and blood of Christ both spiritual and carnal."

On the conclusion of this speech a running conversation between Cranmer and Heath of Worcester followed as to the true meaning of the words 'spiritual' and 'corporal' employed by Tunstall. Mr. Secretary Smythe here interrupted "with a long process" on the same subject, declaring that in his opinion "it could not be the true body, or else He must want His head or His legs", with other details of a similar character.

Heath now recalled the true issues of the discussion by remarking "that reason will not serve in matters of faith," and claiming the simple reality of truth for the words of our Lord.

field was absent from his place on Saturday 15 December, and the bishop of Peterborough on the last two days of the discussion. The Protector and the earl of Warwick were present throughout.

Cranmer now rose for the first time to develop his thesis. He laid it down as certain that "they be two things, to eat the Sacrament and to eat the body of Christ. The eating the body", he said, "is to dwell in Christ, and this may be, although a man never taste the Sacrament". He then introduced to the notice of the House two ideas upon the development of which, in the subsequent course of the discussion, the archbishop's argument chiefly turns. He declared it to be his belief that (1) "the wicked eat not the body of Christ, but their own condemnation," and (2) that "our faith is not to believe Him to be in the bread and wine, but that He is in heaven". The rest of this long speech, although somewhat unpleasant reading, has little to do with the main issue.

Tunstall replied to the archbishop at once with a direct contradiction. He declared that our Lord's "body is in bread and wine, because God hath spoken it, who is able to do it saying: This is my body; and this is my blood".

Canterbury then proposed what to his mind was an insoluble difficulty. "If", he said, "the evil man eat the body he has life everlasting." Hereupon again ensued a series of short interrogatories and replies during which Barlow of Bath and Wells made his solitary contribution towards the settlement of the questions at issue. His intention apparently was to draw the discussion from the main purpose to the side question of the reservation of the Sacrament, and in his endeavour he was seconded by Holbeach of Lincoln. The substance of Barlow's remarks was a series of four quotations from the Fathers of the church.

At this point in the first day's debate bishop Thirlby of Westminster, who had only a few months

before returned from an embassy to the emperor Charles V, rose.¹ He was a man who could lay claim to little theological learning and probably learnt much upon bishop Gardiner of Winchester in such matters. He was however a diplomatist, and whilst his Catholic brethren on the episcopal bench were wholly absorbed in the discussion which was proceeding, he had busied himself in considering the really important point, the impression made on the minds of the listeners upon whose votes the ultimate issue would depend. What that impression must have been may be best gathered from the bishop's own words, and the scene which followed immediately upon them. He advised the "audience to understand that the book that was read, touching the doctrine of the Supper² was not agreed upon among the bishops, but only in disputation; lest the people should think dishonesty in them to stand in argument against their own deed that they had set their hands unto, and for his part," he declared, "he did never allow the doctrine".

This plain enunciation of the position of the bishops with regard to the proposed service book caused consternation among the rulers. Warwick evidently in anger rose to reply. "It was" he said "a perilous word spoken in that audience; and (he) thought him worthy of displeasure, that in such a time when concord is sought for, would cast such occasions of discord among men".

Thirlby's unlooked for and unwelcome intervention brought the discussions of the first day to a sudden close.

¹ Thirlby had returned to England in the latter part of July 1548.

² From the discussion of the Monday following it is clear that this "book" was nothing else but the Communion office of the first Book of Common Prayer.

The next day was Sunday upon which there can be little doubt the Council would have discussed the situation. On Monday (17 December) the debate was resumed in the parliament House. The unexpected turn given to the discussion by the bishop of Westminster was naturally uppermost in the minds of the rulers. The Protector rose on the assembling of the House and addressed himself "first of the words that were spoken on Saturday at night before." His observations had evidently been carefully considered and were marked by studious self-control. "The bishops' consultation" he said "was appointed for unity: the book of their agreement had been read. In Councils, though some consent not unto the thing, yet by the most part it is concluded". In the present case "only the bishop of Chichester (had) refused to agree". And for this refusal he had assigned three reasons, (1) that chrism was omitted in confirmation; (2) that "in the prayer of the communion, where it is written, 'that it may be unto us &c', he would have 'be made unto us &c'". And (3) he desired "to have certain words added after the consecration, which were: 'that these sacrifices and oblations &c'".

To the bishop of Westminster this statement of the Protector as to the previous discussions and agreements of the bishops, full as it may appear to be, seemed insufficient. He now rose in his place in the House and explained his position at length. And first he exposed the considerations which had moved him to the subscription of the proposed Book of Common Prayer. They were four in number: (1) "although of some there is in it too much" still those who held with him "confess it to agree with scripture;" (2) "though many things are wanting in the book", yet it was agreed "they should be treated of afterwards." And in all these matters "he (Thirlby)

desireth to agree with other churches" ¹. (3) He was strongly moved also to agree by a desire to secure concord and unity at home. (4) That as the need of ceremonies in religion was still recognized, the Book did not condemn ceremonial usages still retained in other churches.

But the two great objections which he had to the book as it stood were the abolition of the *elevation* and the *adoration*. For wheresoever the Sacrament is, it ought, he said, to be worshipped; and in proof of this he adduced a striking passage from the works of St. Augustine. In consideration of unity at home, however, he would concede that other things might be altered; but he never consented that the adoration should be left out nor agreed to the doctrine of the book. He held, moreover, that the very diversity of opinions now existing as to the verity of the body and blood made it all the more necessary that the true doctrine of the Sacrament should be plainly set forth ². Also he desired that it should be known that when the book was agreed to by the bishops the word *oblation* was in it, which is now left out.

After this revelation of some part of what had taken place in the previous discussion of the bishops, Thirlby concludes with a general remark. "Things in disputation" he says "are not agreed upon until we allow that which is spoken of. It is a duty to set forth God's truth in plain terms. The want of this plainness in the present case caused him in his conscience not to agree to the doctrine".

For these plain statements the Protector was

¹ This same desire had been already expressed by several bishops in their replies to the series of questions put by Cranmer early in the year 1548. See p. 88 *ante*.

² *i. e.* in the communion service of the Book.

evidently not prepared. Smythe rose and made a somewhat pointless remark. "My lord of Westminster" he said "is persuaded of the verity of the body and blood in the Sacrament: yet touching this book they are all agreed of the doctrine so far as is of me read".

By this time Somerset had made up his mind how to act. He spoke in anger which he did not attempt to conceal. "These vehement sayings" he declared "show rather a wilfulness and an obstinacy to say he will die in it". He would persuade men that he could prove his doctrine by ancient doctors while in fact he brings no authority forward.

Thirlby had had his say, and during the rest of the discussion, with the exception of one remark, he remained silent, leaving to others the task of adducing the authority of ancient doctors for the old belief. The disclosures he had already made, however, afford more information as to the events, which Somerset evidently desired to see involved in obscurity, than can be obtained from any other source.

Bonner of London succeeded. After observing that "when anything is called in question" it must be seen "whether it be decent, lawful and expedient", he proceeded to declare his conviction that the doctrine of the proposed Prayer Book was "not decent, because it has been condemned as heresy, not only abroad, but in this realm also, as in the case of Lambert".¹

"The faults in the book" he said "are these: there is heresy because it is called bread". But before Bonner could develop his thesis or enumerate the other faults, Somerset interrupted him; and after reciting our Lord's words at the last supper from

¹ This, it will be understood, was a home thrust for Cranmer.

SS. Matthew, Mark and Luke, asked: "who can take this otherwise but that there is bread still"? And quoting the words of St. Paul he concluded: "here doth appear plainly that which He blessed He gave to His disciples, and that is bread".

It is unnecessary to give the entire discussion in detail. Here it will be convenient only to mark the salient points. Following the rest of the Catholic party, Day of Chichester expounded the ancient doctrine "that the body is there after the consecration". He declared his belief that "though the form and accidents of the bread remain" it is no longer mere bread, but "the same body that was wounded with the spear and gushed out blood".

Skyp of Hereford addressed himself in particular to Cranmer's proposed difficulty that as the body of Christ was in heaven it could not also be in the Sacrament. He concluded his remarks by the assertion of his faith that the Blessed Sacrament "is the very body that is in heaven"; adding directly to Cranmer, "Lanfranc understood it so, who was your predecessor".

Archbishop Cranmer was supported by Holbeach of Lincoln and next by Ridley of Rochester. Goodrich of Ely contented himself with two or three remarks of no importance, but leaning to the views of the innovators.

The Catholic view was maintained by Tunstall of Durham, Rugg of Norwich, Bonner of London, Heath of Worcester, Day of Chichester, Skyp of Hereford and Thirlby of Westminster. The bishops of Llandaff and Carlisle each made only one remark directed against Cranmer's views.

The Bishop of Lichfield here again shows the confusion of mind, which is to be noted in his replies to the questions on the Sacrament proposed in the

early part of the year. His remarks during the course of the debate were few, but were sufficient to raise in Cranmer's party the hope that they had gained an episcopal convert. On the fourth day however the bishop rose to "deny his conversion which was supposed to be by his words that he spoke upon Monday".

The bishop of Norwich took his stand on the ground of tradition and alleged the liturgies of St. James and St. Clement against the proposed book; just as "Chrysostom and Basil in the canon of their masses" were adduced later on by Tunstall of Durham. Such testimony however was waived aside by the remark of the archbishop "that there is in the beginning of Chrysostom a prayer to himself, which proves that it was not his mass", and by that of Holbeach of Lincoln, that "the mass of St. James cannot be showed".

Ridley proved himself Cranmer's most able coadjutor. He first intervened in the debate towards the close of the second day (17 December). He addressed himself to the question for discussion as defined by Somerset, and his speech is evidently prepared with care. He begins with the monition of St. Peter: "render reason and cause of the faith that is within you". That faith, as regards himself, he explains at length. "As Christ", he says, "took upon Him manhood and remained God, so is bread made by the Holy Ghost holy and remaineth bread still... Still the bread of communion is not mere bread, but bread united to the divinity".

The bishop of Worcester contested Ridley's reasonings. "The text '*hoc est corpus*', you say, does not take away the substance of bread, and there is no other substance but bread; it is meant then that we receive in faith, when we receive the very body". Ridley

thus questioned did not flinch from his position. "Concerning the outward thing it is very bread", he said, "but according to the power of God, is ministered the very body". Heath pressed him to say clearly "whether the receiver takes any substance in the Sacrament or not". Ridley replied, that Christ was really in heaven "and is present in the Sacrament by His working".

The bishop of Worcester then, after pointing out that all the old doctors granted a conversion of the bread, enquired "into what is the bread converted?" Rochester thus pushed answered: "it is converted into the body of Christ", and then, seeming to perceive his blunder, put the question: "how are we turned in baptism"? Spiritually, replied Heath. And thereupon Ridley proceeded further to cover up his mistake by a similitude. "Even", he said, "as a glass receives the light of the sun, but the stone cannot for the light may not pierce through it, so the evil man cannot receive the body".

At this point, where Heath would have evidently proceeded to point out that such a conversion was no conversion at all, Warwick intervened. "Where is your scripture now my Lord of Worcester? Methinks because you cannot maintain your argument neither by scripture nor doctors you would go to, now, with natural reason and sophistry." Heath did not resume the discussion.

Cranmer, however, rose and now gave in a few words the creed of his own party. "I believe", he said, "that Christ is eaten with the heart. The eating with our mouth cannot give us life, for then should a sinner have life. Only good men can eat Christ's body. When the evil (man) eateth the Sacrament, bread and wine, he neither hath Christ's body nor eateth it. The good man hath the Word within him,

and the Godhead by reason of an indissoluble annexion (with) the manhood. Eating with his mouth giveth nothing to man, nor the body being in the bread. Christ gave to his disciples bread and wine, creatures amongst us, and called it His body saying, *Hoc est corpus meum*".

On the last day of the discussion Heath brought Ridley again to the point at which he had been interrupted by Warwick on the previous day, and pressed him to declare what change, if any, was wrought in the elements by the consecration. Ridley replied that the bread "is transformed, for of the common bread before, it is made a divine influence; but the substance of the bread remains as it was before."

Towards the close of the fourth day the prelates on the Catholic side strove to bring the whole question to a more simple issue. Bonner urged his hearers to abide in the ancient doctrine "and go no further than our holy Fathers, that have searched (the scriptures) and come to the belief (which) must be followed. They", he concluded "have found it, we should not then go seek it still, but follow them and believe as they did".

The discussion closed on Wednesday, 19 December, by a reiteration of Cranmer's own belief: and on the same day "the book for the service in the Church" was brought down to the Commons by Mr. Secretary Smythe, read to the members and redelivered to him.

The following day in the house of Lords the "bill for confirmation of service to be used throughout the realm was committed to Mr. Hales, sergeant-at-law": and the next day, 21 December, the parliament adjourned until 2 January (1549).¹ On Monday,

¹ The details of the passage of the Bill through the Lords

the 7th of that month, the "Bill for religion with penalty for the same" was read in the Lords for the first time¹; on the 10th, the second reading was taken, and its third reading with the final voting on Tuesday, 15 January, 1549.

The only lay peers who voted against the measure were the Earl of Derby and the Lords Dacre and Windsor. It is necessary to analyse carefully the votes recorded by the spiritual peers. Of the bishops present, ten voted for the government measure and eight against it. Those approving it, were of course Cranmer, Holbeach, Goodrich, Ridley and Barlow. The other five who followed their leading were Holgate of York, Chambers of Peterborough, (who retired into his diocese immediately after the voting and named as his proxies the bishops of London and Worcester), Salcot of Sarum, Bush of Bristol and Sampson of Lichfield.

The prelates who voted against the new Book were Bonner, Tunstall, Heath, Thirlby, Rugg of Norwich, Aldrich of Carlisle, Skyp of Hereford and Day of Chichester. Of the bishops who were not present at the voting, the vote of Gardiner who was in the Tower, can not be doubtful. Four others were represented by proxies: King of Oxford had named Holbeach and Ridley; Wharton of St. Asaph was represented by Goodrich and Salcot of Sarum; the bishop of Bangor by Salcot, Thirlby and Bush, and the bishop of Chester by Bonner and Thirlby.

are to be seen in the Journals. As the forms of the House were still unsettled, it is sometimes difficult to fix exactly the particular stage at which the reading of a Bill had arrived.

¹ As the title of the Bill was altered before its first reading, it is possible that it was committed to Hales to draw up the form of penalty.

Judged by the proxies therefore the bishops of Oxford and St. Asaph must be considered as voting for the bill, the bishop of Chester against it while Bangor was neutral. Four more of the episcopal bench remain to be accounted for: the proxy of Voysey of Exeter, although called for, only arrived when the voting was over: of Wakeman of Gloucester nothing is known: the bishop of Llandaff, who had spoken against Cranmer during the discussion, was not present at the last; and Ferrar of St. David's was also away; but his opinion cannot be doubted.

Taking all circumstances therefore into consideration the opinion of the bishops upon the new liturgy may fairly be stated as follows: thirteen of their number were favourable to the government measure, ten were opposed to it, whilst the views of the remaining four, the bishops of Llandaff, Bangor, Gloucester and Exeter, may be considered doubtful, although they can hardly be believed to have been favourable.

It may be unnecessary to remark that the government must have brought every pressure to bear on the prelates to secure their support; but even so, their success can hardly be considered such as strongly to recommend the Book imposed to the respect and good will of the nation at large.

The immediate impression made by the events detailed in this chapter may be best gathered from the letters written to foreign reformers by their friends in England. It is singular that beyond an entry in the King's journal and some slight references made at a later period, there is no mention of this momentous discussion in the contemporary english chronicles¹.

¹ The silence of the english chronicles is the more singular since it seems to have been known in Nuremberg and appears in

Even the careful collector Stowe does not record the debate and the full import of the information contained in the Zurich letters can only be understood in the light of the discussion itself, which is here given for the first time. From this document however it is sufficiently clear that Somerset did not intend that more should be known of the real history of the Book than he could help.

On 27 November, 1548, the very day upon which Parliament assembled, John ab Ulmis wrote from Oxford to Bullinger. He notifies in his letter the opening of Parliament and promises to send "by the first opportunity a careful and distinct account of the principal acts¹. The bishops" he at present reports "entertain right and excellent opinions respecting the Holy Supper. That abominable error and silly opinion of a carnal eating has long since been banished and entirely done away with; even that Thomas (Cranmer) himself about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright man, master John à Lasco, is in great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy"².

the appendix of additions to *Carion's Chronicle* by John Funk of that town, although the sequence of events is displaced. "There was also" he writes "a great disputation in the Parliament that year for the putting down of the Mass". See *Carion's Chronicle* &c. printed in London by G. Lynne, 1550, f. 274b.

¹ Unfortunately this promised account is not forthcoming. John ab Ulmis was a protégé of Cox, Dean of Christ Church and chancellor of the university, and his information as to facts would have been probably accurate.

² *Orig. Letters*. Parker Soc. p. 383. It is probable that the writer had heard vague rumours as to the "agreement" of the bishops to the "book"; he would probably be well informed about the religious views of the archbishop.

On 26 December (1548) Peter Martyr wrote from Oxford to his friend Bucer. He explained that he had delayed writing because he had been "awaiting the result of this parliament; but as its proceedings are not yet made known" he cannot yet tell him what is done about religion. "There is however", he says, "generally entertained the best hope of success". He himself is alarmed at two things: the one is "the most obstinate pertinacity of the friends of popery (who) are very numerous and consisting of bishops, doctors and men of that class, who are so cunning as to draw a multitude of ignorant persons along with them, and so bold, that, perceiving the supreme power of this kingdom, which is commonly called a parliament, is shortly about to make some regulations respecting religion, and feeling that the result will not be in their favour, they are consoling themselves with expectations from the emperor, and muttering everywhere that he will not long allow of such proceedings.

"The other matter which distresses me not a little is this, that there is so much contention among our people about the Eucharist that every corner is full of it and even in the supreme Council of the state, in which matters relating to religion are daily brought forward, there is so much disputing of the bishops among themselves and with others, as I think was never heard before. Whence those who are in the lower House, as it is called, that is, men of inferior rank, go up every day into the higher court of parliament, not indeed for the purpose of voting (for that they do in the lower House,) but only that they may be able to hear these sharp and fervent disputations. Hitherto the popish party has been defeated and the palm rests with our friends, but especially with the archbishop of Canterbury, whom

they till now were wont to traduce as a man ignorant of theology, and as being only conversant with matters of government; but now, believe me, he has shewn himself so mighty a theologian against them as they would rather not have proof of, and they are compelled, against their inclination, to acknowledge his learning and power and dexterity in debate. Transubstantiation, I think, is now exploded, and the difficulty respecting the presence is at this time the most prominent point of dispute; but the parties engage with so much vehemence and energy as to occasion very great doubt as to the result; for the victory has hitherto been fluctuating between them". He concludes by saying that the dissensions are so grave in the country that something must be done, and thinks there can be no doubt as to the result, since "the innovations which have everywhere taken place" have been so great that the government "can no longer retrace their steps".¹

At this date then, 26 December, Peter Martyr was only generally informed as to the debate which had taken place in parliament. A few days later, 31 December, Traheron writing to Bullinger from London furnished him with some details. "The argument" he says "was sharply contested by the bishops. The archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly and learnedly maintained your (*i. e.* Bullinger's) opinion upon this subject. His arguments were as follows: The body of Christ was taken up from us into heaven. Christ has left the world. 'Ye have the poor always with you, but me ye have not always' &c. Next followed the bishop of Rochester, who handled the subject with so much eloquence, perspicuity, erudition and power, as to

¹ *Orig. Letters*, pp. 469—70.

stop the mouth of that zealous papist, the bishop of Worcester. The truth never obtained a more brilliant victory among us. I perceive it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side".¹

A second letter of Peter Martyr to Bucer, dated 22 January 1549, shows that notes of the discussion in Parliament had been taken and that this record was at the time in Cranmer's hands. "You must know" he writes, "that many things have been determined in our parliament respecting religion, but with such obstinate opposition from certain bishops as no one ever expected would be the case. The acts however are not yet made public. My lord of Canterbury told Julius that he had forwarded them to me; but I have not yet received them".²

Lastly a letter from an Englishman, John Burcher, to Bullinger and dated from Strasburg, 22 January 1549, suggests several interesting considerations. After details showing the extreme care that was then taken to keep Bullinger fully informed as to all that was taking place in England,³ the writer passes on to give a summary of the english news already forwarded, to make sure of its reaching him. "This was the substance of the first letter" he continues; "the second related to matters of religion, and the discussion which lasted three days between four bishops, namely, the archbishop of Canterbury and another, called Doctor Ferrar⁴ on the part of

¹ Ibid. p. 323.

² Ibid. p. 477.

³ See the details in *Orig. Letters*, p. 644.

⁴ The writer was not well informed in this. Ferrar was not present at the discussion. Ridley doubtless is meant.

the gospel, and the bishops of Worcester and Westminster on the side of popery. Nothing, however, is as yet decided, nor is there any public preaching. But, as I hope you will receive that letter, I pass over the rest. I will not however omit this truly discreet reply which our young king made to the Protector. When the disputation was ended, the Protector accosted the king with an expression of his surprise, saying, 'How very much the bishop of Westminster has deceived my expectation.' 'Your expectation', the king replied, 'he might deceive, but not mine'. When the Protector further enquired the reason, 'I expected', said the king, 'nothing else but that he, who has been so long time with the emperor as ambassador, should smell of the *Interim*'; a reply truly becoming the young king, and which I did not think right to omit"¹.

This extract shows that much reserve was still maintained in regard to the details of the discussion; but no one can doubt, after perusing the report of the debate now printed, that the anecdote related by Burcher is authentic.

A point has now been arrived at when a review may be advantageously taken of the course of events which led up to the passing of the Act of Uniformity. It may be taken that all the bishop of Westminster said in the discussion was true in fact. Still it is obviously not the whole truth as to the compilation of the new service book, but it is probably all that will ever be known about it. Somerset denied nothing, and Cranmer was silent although one remark of Thirlby was practically a public impeachment of the archbishop's good faith and honesty. It is therefore certain that the bishops were called together by

¹ *Orig. Letters* pp. 645—6.

Somerset with the object of coming to some understanding about the proposed Book of Common Prayer.

(1) This meeting appears to have taken place in October, some time after the proclamation in which the first public notice of intended changes in the Liturgy was made (23 Sept. 1548). For upon 29 October, John Burcher at Strasburg already informs Bullinger that "the government roused by" the brawling as to the Sacrament "have convoked a synod of the bishops to consult about religion"¹.

(2) The proposed Prayer Book was submitted to this meeting, and its terms to some extent were discussed, though the chief stress seems to have been laid on the "doctrine".

(3) The bishops present at these meetings did not agree among themselves "as to the doctrine of the Supper" and came to no conclusion.

(4) The assembled bishops all signed the book except Day of Chichester; but this was on the understanding that their action was not to imply any assent to the doctrine of Cranmer and his followers.

(5) The objections to the book centred round this point: that the *adoration* of the Sacrament was left out.

(6) It was allowed that many things were wanting in the book as submitted and it was agreed that these should be treated of afterwards: thus affording an opportunity desired by men like Tunstall, Heath, Bonner and Thirlby himself, of making it more conformable to the ordinary practice of the Church from which, as the book stood, it was a departure.

¹ Ibid p. 643. Somerset's words are formal: "the bishops' consultation" (Debate. Royal MS. 17 B. xxxix f. 5d.) It is worthy of note that in parliament the Protector says nothing, when speaking of the meeting, about "other best learned men".

(7) The book after the bishops had signed it was tampered with.

Beyond these facts, some conjecture may safely be made as to the motives which induced the bishops to sign the proposed liturgy. The whole country had been stirred up: it was a scene of confusion and wrangling the continuance of which would seriously jeopardize "the unity at home in this realm". At the same time the government had so managed their foreign policy as to make domestic tranquillity imperative. The kingdom was at war with Scotland and there was in prospect a breach with France against which country the Protector was unable, as Henry had done, to play off the emperor. Thus apart from the religious beliefs and designs of Cranmer and Somerset there seemed to be an absolute need for some english *Interim*¹.

The real opinion of the Catholic bishops as to the proper solution of the difficulty is clear from the report of the debate and their subsequent action. And whatever judgment may be passed on them for signing a book in regard to which they had such manifest scruples,² it must be allowed that a difficult position had been prepared for them and that at the time the appeal to their love of country must have come with great force.

In fact it is hardly too much to say that the Catholic party amongst the bishops was caught in a trap. They were induced to sign a book which was wholly inadequate, on extraneous considerations and under a pledge for subsequent revision. They were then launched on a public discussion in

¹ It was reported at this time that the emperor was pressing some such measure on the english government. See a letter of John ab Ulmis to Bullinger 27 Nov. 1548, *Orig. Lett.* p. 383.

² Royal MS. 17B. xxxix f. 6.

Parliament at which it was calculated they would not dare to show themselves inconsistent. The expectation however of the government was so far disappointed. And it is not wonderful that when their false position was made clear to the Catholic bishops, they through Bonner declared, "there is heresy in the book".

Before passing on to consider the character of the new liturgy imposed on the english Church by the Act of Uniformity, some brief expression of opinion formed after careful consideration of the available evidence may be expected upon some of the more obscure points of its history.

(1) It is most probable that no formal commission was ever issued to compile the Prayer Book. Such a commission imposes responsibility and confers rights. This was not the method commonly employed in Edward's reign. It was a time of governmental formulæ, one of which occurs again and again in official documents throughout this period of history to designate the persons engaged in preparing the liturgical changes. "The godly bishops and best learned men", covers as much or as little as those in power might please. Without issuing a definite commission they were free to call whom they would, to what place they would, as well as to vary the individuals engaged on the work at their pleasure. In a word it is doubtful whether any "Windsor commission", if by that expression it is meant to designate any definite body of men formally appointed to undertake the task, ever had any existence.

(2) Strype is probably right in considering that the "Prayer Book went through only a few hands". Whose hands these were is tolerably clear from the result, but the only positive statement that can be made is, that Cranmer had the chief part in the inspiration and composition.

(3) It is most probable that the compilation was long meditated and its progress to its ultimate form gradual. It would appear likely also that the matins and even-song in english at St. Paul's and the english mass at Westminster in the May of 1548 ¹ as well as the offices in use in the King's chapel in September, were substantially those afterwards incorporated in the first Book of Common Prayer.

(4) For the "certain bishops and notable learned men", assembled at Chertsey and Windsor by the King's command, nothing was left to do but to put together, and give the final touches to the material already prepared. The book thus completed was submitted in October, or in the early days of November to the bishops. These two assemblages were distinct in regard both to their object and the persons composing them.

(5) The report of the discussion in parliament does away with any lingering doubt as to whether the english liturgy was approved by the clergy in Convocation or not. Had such been the case Somerset and Cranmer could not have failed to retort that approval upon Thirlby ².

¹ see p. 102 *ante*.

² The same may be said of Somerset's letter to Pole of 4 June 1549 in defence of the new Prayer Book. He elaborately recounts "the common agreement of all the chief learned men in the realm... as well bishops as other equally and indifferently chosen", "first agreement on points", "and then the same coming to the judgment of the whole parliament... by one whole consent of the upper and nether house of the parliament finally concluded and approved; and so a form of rite and service, a creed and doctrine and religion and after that sort allowed, set forth and established by act and statute (Pocock, *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, ed Camden Soc. p. X) Is it possible to suppose that Somerset here too would not have pleaded the formal and synodical sanction of the Book of Common Prayer by Convocation had any such been given?

CHAPTER XII

THE FIRST ENGLISH BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

The act of parliament imposing the Prayer Book was rightly called the Act of Uniformity. For, as the preface of the book itself declares in emphatic terms, "now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use".

The forms of public prayer are the very centre and kernel of the religious life of a Christian people. The new book displaced the traditional liturgy in England, the origin and history of which are so lost in the obscurity of time that they afford little more than objects for the speculation and conjectures of the learned. The various Books of Common Prayer given to the english church during the last three centuries are merely modifications of this first Prayer Book of 1549. And thus from whatever point of view the new liturgy be regarded it is without doubt one of the most momentous documents connected with the ecclesiastical history of England. It becomes therefore a matter of the first importance to gain if possible a clear and definite idea of its character, its relation to the old service books which it superseded and to other new liturgical formulæ which were put forth in other countries about the same time.

Any enquiry of this kind, however, presents diffi-

culties apart from the mere critical investigation demanded by so important an historical document. Every liturgical book, whatever may be thought of its intrinsic character, or of the intentions of its composers, has on the face of it a certain claim to forbearance and respect. A Catholic, who sees in the living liturgy of the roman church the essential forms, "which remain still what they were 1200, perhaps nearly 1400, years ago",¹ cannot but feel a personal love for those sacred rites which come to him with all the authority of centuries. Any rude handling of such forms must cause deep pain to those who know and use them. For they come to them from God, through Christ and through the Church. But they would not have such attraction were they not also sanctified by the piety of so many generations who have prayed in the same words and found in them steadiness in joy and consolation in sorrow.²

And although the book now to be considered manifestly does not possess the same titles to veneration, still for three centuries it has been associated with the most holy thoughts, feelings and aspirations of the majority of Englishmen. Thus whilst its importance demands that it should be examined as an historical document, such scrutiny should be regulated by consideration for the attachment of those to whom it is a living reality.

For the present purpose the investigation is limited. The saying '*lex orandi, lex credendi*' is after all only of the most general application. And it is obvious that a form of prayer, whilst it assumes a truth

¹ Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. xv.

² Cf. Duchesne *Origines du Culte Chrétien* pp. vii—viii.

need not, and generally does not, express it in distinct and formal terms. The attempt therefore to deduce from liturgical books a definite doctrinal formula much less a system of doctrine must end in failure. The primary aim of any liturgical formula is to assist the piety of the faithful, not to afford a touchstone of error, for whilst it expresses the truth so far as it goes, it is not intended as a full exposition or expression of it. Accordingly the actual doctrine of the book need not be considered. Here it will be sufficient to mark the manner in which the new service book agrees with or differs from the traditional books then in use and the new contemporary liturgies. To rightly estimate the character of the Prayer Book of 1549 in relation to the ancient liturgy the omissions are obviously of primary importance; and in relation to new forms the points of agreement.¹

In such an investigation no account need be taken of resemblances or analogies between the English Prayer Book and other liturgies eastern or western which there is no reason whatever for supposing were really used by the compilers as one of their sources of inspiration.² It is consequently only ne-

¹ In short the new liturgy stood in relation to mediæval forms as a practical criticism and judgment of them. See the excellent remarks of Kliefoth *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, vii, pp. 3-4.

² Works like those of Palmer and Scudamore are interesting and valuable, but such commentaries have little to do with the historical character of the book of 1549. They are also often disfigured by a want of real acquaintance with mediæval liturgy and their aim and method are rather those of Apologetics than of History. To use the words of the liturgist Daniel, a judge, it is certain, equally disinterested and competent: "*Doctis anglie scriptoribus, alias omnino dignissimis cultu atque officio, in deliciis est, omnes ritualis sui paginas contexere et concinnare non ex 'romanis libris (nam hi recentiores sunt quam ut ferri*

cessary here to consider what might have been actual sources from which these compilers could have derived either suggestion or material. These are (1) the ancient uses, chiefly Sarum, York and Hereford, which then existed in England; (2) the breviary of Cardinal Quignon; (3) the Greek liturgies; (4) the Mozarabic, or ancient rite of Spain.

This last (the Mozarabic) may conveniently be considered first. The opinion that this rite was used in the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer rests upon two points of evidence: first on a similarity in the words of Institution of the Sacrament; secondly on the form of blessing the font. In regard to the first point it will appear later that this was derived not from the Mozarabic, but from a contemporary liturgy. In regard to the second, it seems certain that the form must have been obtained either directly or indirectly from the spanish liturgy. But there are difficulties connected with the case. It is true that the missal and breviary of this rite were printed in the beginning of the sixteenth century, but as the impression was for actual liturgical use at the time it was not in the ordinary book market and so late as 1540 there was not even a copy in the Vatican library. ¹ What is still more to the present purpose is that the liturgist Cassander, whom nothing escaped, sought in vain for years to discover any copy of the missal and it was not until the year 1565 within a few months of his death that he heard of one at Vienna. This was in the hands of

possint) sed ex Ægyptiis, Africanis, Gallicanis, Mozarabis. Sed, ut hoc Palmeri pace dixerim, perpauca inde desumpta sunt, plurima ex romanis liturgiis, singula ex reformatis". (*Codex Liturg. Eccl. Univ.* iii p. 349 note).

¹ So Alvarez Gomez in his life of Ximenes published in 1569. The Pope sent specially to Toledo for a copy.

the celebrated John Sambucus and (as from circumstances it may be inferred) there was no copy in the imperial library. ¹

If a copy had existed in England it can hardly have disappeared. There is no trace of such a book in the catalogue of the Royal library in 1542 and if it had been in Cranmer's library it would almost certainly have passed through Lord Lumley into the Royal collection, now in the British Museum. Some portion of this blessing of the font survives in the present Prayer Book, but the means whereby it found its way into the book of 1549 is a problem yet to be solved.

The case is different as regards the greek liturgies. These had been known in England both in the original and in ancient and sixteenth century translations. As early as 1510 or 1511 Erasmus gave bishop Fisher a translation of the mass of St. Chrysostom which he had made ² and this latin version had appeared in print at least three times before the compilation of the Prayer Book. The first print of the masses of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil appeared at Rome in 1526 and the same year Stokesley, bishop of London was able to lend a copy to Fisher. ³ Numerous prints had appeared by the year 1548, and whatever may have been the use made of the greek liturgies in the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer, it is quite certain that they were perfectly well known to all interested in the theological dis-

¹ See *Cassandri opera* (1616) pp. 1094, 1097-8, 1099, 1217-18.

² Fisher, *De Veritate Corporis* f. 64a. It was sent to Colet in 1513.

³ Fisher, *ut sup.* 64a. 87a.

cussions of the time.¹ How far they were in fact used will appear later.

As to the roman breviary of Quignon, in the book of 1549 no part remained but what had been in-

¹ So far as the greek liturgies are concerned, the following seems to have been the available material in the year 1549. The *Clementine* liturgy and that of *St. James* were known only by extracts in the tract of Bessarion, *de Sacramento Eucharistiæ*, of which two editions at least had appeared. Of the liturgy of *St. Basil*, the greek appeared at Rome in 1526, Witzel had printed his own translation and a second translation from an ancient MS. at Mentz in 1546. Gentiannus Hervetus printed his translation at Venice in 1548; and Cochläus had published another ancient MS. in his *Speculum* at Mentz in 1549. The liturgy of *St. Chrysostom* had been considerably altered between the 12th and 16th century. The greek 16th century text appeared at Rome in 1526 and at Venice 1528, and latin translations of this text at Venice 1528, and Prague 1544; Hervetus' translation, Venice 1548, seems also to have been of this text. Erasmus' version was from a 12th century text. It appeared at Paris 1537, at Colmar 1540, among *St. Chrysostom's* works 1547; and it is said in the edition of 1537 also. The 12th century version of Leo Thuscus appeared at Colmar in 1540 from a MS. in the library of the Augustinians, whilst the Dominican Ambrosius Pelargus printed at Worms in 1541 a translation from a greek MS. which he had found at the collegiate Church of St. Simeon at Treves. Finally Witzel printed in 1540 a german translation (See Horawitz and Hertfelder, *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus* p. 466).

Although some of these prints were but small volumes or tracts it is certain that they were not unknown in England. (Cf. Richard Smith's *Defence of the Sacrament of the altar* (1546) f. 59—60). It is remarkable that whilst they are freely quoted by writers on the Catholic side, Smith, Tunstall, Gardiner, their testimony is ignored by Cranmer and his friends (see p. 168 *ante*. There is also a single reference in Cranmer's *Defence*, 1549; and one in his Common Place Books, MS. Reg. 7. B. XII fol. 164a).

corporated in the Preface, and such general influence as it may be supposed to have exercised in regard to the continuous reading of Scripture.

There remains to be considered what relation the new service book had to the ancient english uses. The way in which these vary one from the other is interesting to the specialist, but the variant parts themselves are not of such magnitude as to be of any practical import. There is nothing moreover in the Book of Common Prayer which can certainly be referred to the influence of York or Hereford as distinct from Sarum. It will be sufficient therefore to take as the standard of comparison the Sarum books, which is tantamount to taking the Roman; for here again although the differences are of interest, they are unimportant for the present purpose. What has lately been said of the breviary holds good of the missal. "These local peculiarities are by no means so extensive as is sometimes supposed."¹

Before entering upon a detailed examination, the service book itself must be briefly described. After the preface and the tables of psalms and lessons follows the order for matins and evensong daily throughout the year. This part of the book, with the litany, corresponds to the breviary of the old service. Then comes "the Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion commonly called the Mass", which took the place of the ancient missal. The offices of baptism, matrimony, the visitation of the sick, the burial service and the purification of women represents the ancient manual or ritual; and the short office of confirmation is all that then represented the pontifical. The book concludes with what is now called the "Commination

¹ Cambridge reprint of the Sarum Breviary, III p. xxviii.

service", which had no forerunner in the ancient liturgical books, and by an advertisement about ceremonies and "notes" on the same subject.

According to the traditional and universal practice of Christendom the mass, by whatever name it may be called, was the great public service of worship. To it all other offices were subordinate and accessory. It was this, as will already have appeared, which was the main point of controversy in the early years of Edward's reign. "The Book of the Communion", as Cranmer calls it, must therefore necessarily be the centre and substance of the whole investigation, and in the first place this new order of "the Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass" must be compared with the ancient rite.

(1) It opens with the following rubric: "So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the curate over night or else in the morning, afore the beginning of matins, or immediately after"¹. The first rubric therefore maintains the novelty introduced by the 'Order of Communion' attached to the mass by the innovators in 1548, that intending communicants should signify to the priest their intention, either over night or in the morning².

(2) In the fourth rubric the priest is directed in this service to "put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say a white alb plain with a vestment or cope". It must here be explained that a cope was not specifically a sacerdotal vestment but might be worn by any cleric³.

¹ Parker Soc. ed. p. 76.

² Parker Soc. ed. p. 76. Griffith and Farran's edition p. 193. These two editions will be subsequently referred to as P. and G. respectively. All the first four rubrics are new.

³ A great number of these clerics were in mediaeval England

By the 'vestment' the chasuble is unquestionably meant and the term is wide enough to cover the use of the amice, stole and other vestments worn by the priest in the celebration of mass. The chasuble was essentially the sacrificial vesture, reserved for the priesthood and practically might be worn by no one of a lower order. By this rubric therefore the use of the chasuble at the service, "commonly called the mass" is made optional. Thus the first direction in a book expressly intended to bring about uniformity was calculated to introduce a marked diversity of practice in a matter which could not fail to be noted by all. It may be taken as certain that those attached to the ancient custom would vest as before whilst those who desired change would adopt the cope which broke with past ecclesiastical tradition and the universal practice, and enabled them to display their rejection of the sacrificial character of the service.

(3) The service itself opened by "the clerks singing in english for the Office or Introit (as they call it) a psalm appointed for the day"¹. Originally the introit of the mass was a whole psalm or at least many verses, but by the eighth or ninth century this had been reduced to two or three verses as at present. The restoration of a whole psalm may therefore be regarded as a return to antiquity.

As regards the choice of psalms for these introits, however, the case is different. It might have been considered sufficient to adopt those indicated in the old introits of the Sarum missal; but the compilers have adopted a scheme in which their introit psalm

practically laymen, living in secular avocations. Although perhaps not according to strict rubric the cope is still often worn by laymen pure and simple.

¹ P. p. 76. G. p. 193.

corresponds to that of Sarum in one case only ¹. The thoroughness with which this departure from the old order was carried out does not admit a doubt as to its being intentional.

(4) Whilst this introit was being sung by the choir, the priest "standing humbly before the midst of the altar" is to say the Lord's Prayer and a collect. The former is evidently suggested by the opening of the Sarum mass ² and the collect might probably be regarded by the people as equivalent to the ancient confession. He then reads the introit psalm, apparently to himself, if there has been singing.

(5) The rubrics of the new Prayer Book are confined from this point to the end of the creed to an indication of mere sequence. Up to 1549 an elaborate ceremonial had accompanied the whole of this portion of the mass and no guidance is now given to the priest as to the continuance or disuse of the ancient customs other than certain vague and general indications in the Act of Uniformity itself. ³ There is

¹ The Sarum introit for the third mass on Christmas day is from the psalm which is appointed for the first communion in the Prayer Book of 1549. On one day, the Ascension, the Prayer Book psalm agrees with the roman missal Ps. 46 (47), whilst the Sarum has adopted a verse from the Acts. This probably is a mere accidental resemblance as that on the 17th and 21st sundays after Trinity certainly is. It is difficult to see any reason why in many cases the old order was not retained, as for example on St. Michael's day, when psalm 102 (103), which is singularly appropriate to the festival of the angels, is rejected in favour of psalm 112 (113), which is as curiously inappropriate.

² Sarum Missal (Burntisland ed., col. 579).

³ It is forbidden in the Act of Parliament, for example, for any one to compel any parson &c. "to sing or say any common or open Prayer, or to minister any Sacrament otherwise or in any

however nothing in the enacting clauses forbidding the priest to use the old ceremonial, whilst the rubrics are so scanty that he is necessarily left to his own interpretation as to what he should do or not do, except in one point: the rubric clearly contemplates that the ceremonies hitherto used at the reading of the gospel were to be omitted. Setting aside therefore all questions of ceremonial the service now followed closely the old order of the mass, with the Kyrie, Gloria, collects, epistle, gospel and Creed. The gradual, or tract, or sequence interposed previously between the epistle and gospel was however omitted. "Immediately after the Epistle ended", says the new rubric, "the priest or one appointed to read the Gospel shall say the Holy Gospel".

(6) After the creed are inserted the three exhortations which opened the Communion Book of 1548, but their order is inverted.¹ These having no liturgical

other manner or form than is mentioned in the said book." Also the Lords pray "that all ministers be bound to say and use the services in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book and none other or otherwise". On the other hand among "the notes for the more plain explication and decent ministration of things contained in the book" printed at the end of the notice on ceremonies is the following: "as touching kneeling, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast and other gestures, they may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth without blame" (P. p. 157 G. p. 268). That this rubric refers to the clergy and not to the laity is clear from Bucer's *Censura* p. 465. These notes are entirely omitted in the Book of 1552. It is certain however from the injunctions of Ridley and Hooper and those commonly attributed to the king (see Burnet II. 2. 165 or Cardwell, *Documentary Annals* I, 63) that some time before 1552 these practices had been commonly forbidden and that the prohibition ultimately rests on the royal authority.

¹ The wording and arrangement of these exhortations has been

importance and merely standing, as the rubric explains, in place of a homily, ¹ need not be further considered.

(7) At this point in the new service occurs a distinct break with the ancient practice. At least as late as the ninth century the Roman rite still observed the early practice of the offering by the people of the bread and wine for the sacrifice ², and whilst this offering was being made the choir sang a portion of a psalm which became known as the *offertory*. ³ The bread and wine thus presented were offered with ritual oblation by the priest and the prayer now called the *secret* was said by him. These prayers which vary in every mass, and which are

varied in different revisions of the Prayer Book, but the following table will best explain the changes in position :

1548.	1549.	1552.	Present book.
1	2 + 3	4 (new)	1 + 3
2	1	1	4
3		2 + 3	2

¹ P. p. 79. G. p. 196.

² This had already disappeared from other liturgies, whilst traces of the practice remain in the Western Church even to the present day.

³ The detail of the rite is given with accuracy in the very valuable *Ordo Romanus* edited by Gerbert from a S. Blasien MS. which is evidently the result of personal observation and information obtained on the spot. "Veniens igitur Pontifex ante altare accipit oblationes proprias episcoporum, &c, et ipse ponet eas super altare; ipse vero Pontifex novissime suas proprias duas accipiens in manus suas elevans oculis et manibus cum ipsis ad cœlum orat ad Dominum secrete et completa oratione ponit eas super altare. Tunc vero archidiaconus accipiens calicem a subdiacono ponit ipsum juxta oblationes Pontificis ad dexteram partem; tunc Pontifex inclinato vultu in terram super oblationes dicit orationem, ita ut nullus præter Dominum et ipsum audiat nisi tantum : *Per omnia sæcula &c.* (Gerbert, *Monumenta* II. 169—70).

still retained in the Roman missal, express the idea of sacrifice and oblation. In the later middle ages private devotion introduced a number of prayers, all expressive of the same idea, to accompany the various ritual acts: thus in the Sarum rite the priest is directed "to lift up the chalice in both hands, offering the sacrifice to our Lord saying this prayer: "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation" &c.¹ The whole therefore of this action was called the offertory, and the verse of the psalm itself became generally known under this name.²

This entire portion of the mass, constituting the act of formal oblation, together with the prayers, new and old, which accompanied it, are swept away in the new service of the Prayer Book. In place of it was put a verse of Holy Scripture appropriate to what was now done; namely the collecting of money "for the poor man's box", which was called the "offertory."³ At the same time the family to whose

¹ The Sarum rubrics are particularly emphatic in calling by anticipation the elements so offered "the Sacrifice" (pp. 593—4).

² Cf. Lydgate's and Langford's meditation in '*Lay Folk's mass Book*' p. 233.

³ The whole of this question of offertory and offering is so confused by the use of the same word in different senses in the rubrics of the Prayer Book that it seems necessary to explain it somewhat at length.

a) When the practice of presenting the actual bread and wine for the sacrifice fell into disuse, an offering in money was substituted. This partook of a certain ritual solemnity and was not what is now understood by a "collection". The people went up to the altar and placed their "offering" in the hands of the priest. The money was for his use as he now had to provide the necessary bread and wine. This ceremony was known as "the offering"; or as it is now called in France the "*offrande*". In the Book of 1549 the word 'offering' is used in two senses: (1) of "offering" proper (P. p. 84 last three lines;

“turn it fell to offer for the charges of the Communion” made their donation in the ancient way into the hands of the priest.

The singing of the verses of Scripture appropriate to alms deeds was continued whilst the collection was being made¹. And after this “so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the choir or in some convenient place near the choir; the men on the one side, the women on the other. All other that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion shall depart out of the choir except the ministers and clerks”.

It was only then that without any ceremony

G. p. 200 lines 12—14) and (2) the poor box collection (P. p. 82 last line. G. p. 198 last line of rubric).

(b) The difficulty is further complicated by the introduction of another provision. It was anciently the practice in England, as it still is in France, to bless a loaf of bread, which was then cut up and distributed to the people during the mass. The bread was supplied by each family in the parish in turn. This “blessed bread” was now (1549) abolished but the obligation was laid upon each family who had hitherto supplied it to offer every Sunday “at the time of the offertory the just value and price of the holy loaf to the use of their pastors and curates, and that in such order and course as they were wont to find and pay the said holy loaf”. This offering was to be made to the priest, whilst the collection for the poor was being made in the church, “in recompense for the costs and charges he was at in finding sufficient bread and wine for the Holy Communion”.

(c) But this was not all: it was further provided, that one person at least of that house in every parish to which it fell under the new arrangement “to offer for the charges of the Communion, or some other whom they shall provide to offer for them, shall receive the Communion with the priest”.

¹ In this way the word “offertory” has in English come to mean “a collection”; a sense which is wanting to the word in other languages.

whatever "the minister" placed the bread and wine on the altar¹. It will therefore appear that the ancient ritual oblation, with the whole of which the idea of sacrifice was so intimately associated, was swept away. This was certainly in accord with Cranmer's known opinions², and the character of the change is unmistakable when the new Prayer Book is compared with other service books compiled in the same century.

To understand the full import of the novelty it must be borne in mind that this ritual oblation had a place in all liturgies. It is moreover now known, by the debate in parliament, that the word 'oblation' occurred in the book when it was presented to the bishops for examination, but had disappeared from it before it came up to the Lords³.

(8) After the placing of the bread and wine upon the altar the service returns to the missal and the priest salutes the people with: "The Lord be with you", whilst the succeeding versicle: "Lift up your hearts" carries the thoughts back to the earliest ages of the church. The number of proper Prefaces is however reduced from ten to five. Of these, two are new compositions⁴, a third is about half new⁵, a fourth is curtailed about half⁶ and the fifth is but slightly altered from the original⁷. After the Preface the Sanctus follows as in the old missals; but with a variety in the translation, the import of which only

¹ The "mixed chalice" was retained in the book of 1549.

² Cf. his replies to the questions on the mass.

³ It will be understood that no opinion is expressed on the question whether or no the 'lesser oblation' is to be found in the present Anglican Prayer Book.

⁴ Christmasday and Whitsunday.

⁵ Ascension day.

⁶ Trinity Sunday.

⁷ Easter day.

appears when compared with the form in the Book of 1552.

(9) The service now entered upon that part which gave it character and validity, or rather which is the principle of its life; namely the *Canon*. This is known in early writings as the *Canon actionis*; or emphatically by the simple word *actio*, as the one act upon which all the rest of the service depends. "We venture to suggest" says a recent writer "that a true view of the eucharistic sacrifice, at least of the *missa fidelium*, can only be gained by looking at it as a whole, as one great act of eucharistic sacrifice ¹.

However this may be of the *missa fidelium* generally, it is certainly true of the Canon ². Our present detailed knowledge of this most sacred part of the mass goes back certainly 1300 years. And with the exception of one short clause added by St. Gregory it has remained practically unchanged to the present day ³. This fact, that it has so remained unaltered during thirteen centuries, is the most speaking witness of the veneration with which it has always been regarded and of the scruple which has ever been felt at touching so sacred a heritage, coming to us from unknown antiquity ⁴.

It is now necessary to understand how the compilers of the new book dealt with this sacred prayer. For this purpose the two prayers are here printed side

¹ Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* p. xxxvii. The remarks of the writer at this place deserve the best consideration.

² The word *canon* is here used in its strict sense of the *Canon actionis* or prayer of consecration.

³ Compare in Daniel the Gelasian and Gregorian canons.

⁴ This is all the more striking since there are passages in it which it is not easy to explain. Cf. Duchesne, *Origines* &c. p. 173 (especially the note) and p. 174; Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, pp. 98—9, 110—11.

by side; the passages or words in which they agree are in italics so as to show at a glance what is retained, what is rejected and what is added ¹.

¹ The translation from the York missal of the late Canon Simmons in the *Lay Folk's Mass Book* (pp. 105—111) has been adopted, with one or two changes to make the version more literal, and in a few other cases where the words of the Book of Common Prayer have been substituted. Of course it is hardly necessary to explain that by whatever name the Canon be called, whether Roman, Sarum, or York, it is one and the same. The following table of variants of the Canon of the present Roman (S. Pius V. 1570) Sarum, York and Hereford missals may be convenient.

Pian.	Sarum.	York.	Hereford.
(1) —	pro Rege nostro N	pro Rege nostro N	pro Rege nostro N
(2) circumstantium quorum	circumstantium quorum	circumstantium atque omnium fidelium Christianorum quorum (The Sarum of 1554 has this reading)	circumstantium quorum
(3) semper	semperque AND semper	semper	semper
(4) Petri et Pauli	Petri, Pauli	Petri, Pauli	Petri, Pauli
(5) tu Deus in omnibus	tu Deus omnipotens in omnibus	tu Deus omnipotens in omnibus	tu Deus in omnibus
(6) benedixit, fregit	benedixit, fregit	benedixit ac fregit	benedixit ac fregit
(7) postquam	posteaquam	posteaquam	posteaquam
(8) deditque	deditque	deditque	dedit
(9) in mei memoriam	in mei memoriam	in mei memoriam	in memoriam mei
(10) servi tui	tui servi	tui servi	tui servi
(11) Filii tui Domini nostri	Filii tui Domini Dei nostri	Filii tui Domini Dei nostri	Filii tui Domini Dei nostri

The ancient rubrics are omitted, since in the Book of 1549 they are swept away altogether and the following are substituted: (1) the prayer "shall be said or sung plainly and distinctly;" hitherto it had been said secretly; (2) there shall be no elevation "or showing the Sacrament to the people;" and (3) and (4) the elements shall be taken into the hands.

SARUM.

Therefore most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ thy Son, our Lord,

PRAYER BOOK 1549.¹

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's church.

Almighty and everliving God which by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications and to give thanks for all men¹,

(12) tibi obtulit	tibi obtulit	tibi obtulit	obtulit tibi
(13) Per eundem Christum (at end of <i>supplices</i>)	Per eundem Christum	Per eundem Jesum Christum	Per eundem Christum
(14) Memento etiam Domine famulorum	Memento etiam Domine animarum famulorum	Memento etiam Domine famulorum	Memento etiam Domine famulorum
(15) Anastasia et omnibus	Anastasia cum omnibus	Anastasia et cum omnibus	Anastasia et cum omnibus

¹ In Cranmer's work on the Eucharist published in 1550 the fifth and last book is really a defence of the Prayer Book now set forth, with the praise of which he concludes. It is written with evident reference to the text of this new Canon and thus forms a most valuable indication of the sense in which it was drawn up. As to his intention to take away the mass "clearly out of Christian churches as being manifest wickedness and idolatry" see chapter IX, ed. Parker Soc. p. 349 and beginning of Chapter XII p. 350-1.

SARUM.

we humbly pray and beseech Thee to receive these gifts, these offerings, these holy undefiled sacrifices, which first of all we offer to Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church, which do Thou vouchsafe to keep in peace, to watch over, to knit together and govern throughout the whole world, together with Thy servant our Pope and our Bishop N.,

and our King N.,

and all right believers and maintainers of the Catholic and Apostolic faith.

1549.

we humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto Thy Divine Majesty, beseeching Thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity and concord: and grant that all they that do confess Thy holy name may agree in the truth of Thy holy word and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech Thee to save and defend Thy servant Edward our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed. And grant unto his whole council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice and to the maintenance of God's true religion and virtue. Give grace (O Heavenly Father) to all Bishops, Pastors and Curates that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth Thy true and lively word, and rightly

SARUM.

Remember, O Lord, Thy
servants and handmaid-
ens, N.,

and all here standing
around whose faith is
known and devotion noted
by Thee; for whom we
offer unto Thee, or who
are offering unto Thee,
this *sacrifice of praise* for
themselves and all theirs,
for the redemption of
their souls, for the hope
of their salvation and
safety, and unto Thee, eter-
nal God, living and true,
are rendering their vows.

In communion with
and venerating the me-
mory *chiefly* of the glo-

1549.

and duly administer Thy
holy sacraments: and to
all Thy people give Thy
heavenly grace, that with
meek heart and due rever-
ence they may hear and
receive Thy holy word
truly serving Thee in ho-
liness and righteousness
all the days of their life.
And we most humbly be-
seech thee of Thy goodness
(O Lord) to comfort and
succour all them which
in this transitory life be
in trouble, sorrow, need,
sickness or any other ad-
versity.

And especially we
commend unto Thy mer-
ciful goodness this con-
gregation which is here
assembled in Thy name,
to celebrate the comme-
moration of the most
glorious death of Thy Son.

And here we do give
unto Thee most high
praise and hearty thanks

SARUM.

*rious and ever virgin
Mary the mother of Thy
Son Jesus Christ our God
and Lord,*

*and also of Thy blessed
Apostles and Martyrs
Peter, Paul, Andrew,
James, John, Thomas,
James, Philip, Bartholo-
mew, Matthew, Simon
and Thaddeus, Linus,
Cletus, Clement, Sixtus,
Cornelius, Cyprian, Lau-
rence, Chrysogonus, John
and Paul, Cosmas and
Damian and of all Thy
saints; by whose merits
and prayers grant that
we may in all things be
defended by the help of
Thy protection through
the same Jesus Christ
our Lord.*

1549.

*for the wonderful grace
and virtue declared in
all Thy saints from the be-
ginning of the world: and
chiefly in the glorious and
most blessed virgin Mary
mother of Thy Son Jesu
Christ our Lord and God,
and in the Holy Patri-
archs, Prophets, Apostles
and Martyrs;*

*whose examples (O
Lord) and steadfastness
in thy faith and keeping
Thy holy commandments
grant us to follow.*

*We commend unto Thy
mercy (O Lord) all other
Thy servants which are
departed hence from us,
with the sign of faith, and
now do rest in the sleep of
peace. Grant unto them*

SARUM.

This oblation therefore of our service as also of thy whole household, we beseech thee, O Lord, that having been reconciled thou wouldest accept; and wouldest order our days in Thy peace,

and ordain that we be delivered from eternal damnation, and numbered with the flock of thine elect, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Which oblation, do thou, we beseech Thee, O God almighty, vouchsafe to render altogether blessed, counted, reckoned, reasonable and acceptable;

1549.

we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace,

and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son, may altogether be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world: grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only mediator and advocate.

O God heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesu Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation, once offered) a full, perfect,

SARUM.

1549.

and sufficient sacrifice,
 oblation, and satisfaction,
 for the sins of the whole
 world, and did institute,
 and in His holy Gospel
 command us to celebrate
 a perpetual memorial of
 this His precious death,
 until His coming again:
 Hear us (O merciful
 Father) we beseech Thee
 and, with Thy Holy Spirit
 and word vouchsafe to
 bl + ess and sanc + tify ¹

¹ There can be no reasonable doubt that this passage was suggested by the invocation of the Holy Ghost found after the words of institution in the greek liturgies. The forms of this invocation in the Clementine liturgy and in those of St. James, St. Basil and St. Chrysostom were well known at this time from Bessarion's tract "*de Sacramento Eucharistiæ*" (for the passages see in ed. Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* vol. 161 col. 493; 500—1; 504—6; 510; 514—5; 517—8; 519) and it seems not unlikely that it was the special form in St. Basil's liturgy, the only one in which both words "bless and sanctify" occur, which set the model. In these old forms however the prayer for the change of the elements is absolute and there is nothing which corresponds to the "unto us" of the Prayer Book, which was taken from the roman missal. Although the form of these words insisted upon by bishop Day, "that they may be *made*" may also correspond to the "*ut fiant*" of the Roman canon, it is more probable that his demand was suggested by the "*efficiat*" or "*faciat*" of the greek liturgies as given by Bessarion. Had the old form been retained as desired by Day it might have fairly been held that the old doctrine was continued; but in the changed form, "that they may be unto us," as it is inserted in the book of 1549, there is

SARUM.

that it may be made unto us the Bo + dy and Bl + ood of Thy most dearly beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ.

Who on the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands and with His eyes raised up towards heaven unto Thee, God, His Father Almighty, giving thanks to Thee, He bless + ed, brake, and gave to His disciples saying, take and eat ye all of this, for this is my Body.

In like manner after supper taking also this

1549.

these Thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine *that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.*¹

Who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples saying: Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me

Likewise after supper He took the cup, and

nothing which is not perfectly reconcilable with the Helvetian doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It must be remembered that this change was no accident, but the compilers purposely kept this form of words in face of opposition.

¹ On the question whether this was meant to exclude the ancient Catholic doctrine, see Cranmer's *Defence*, Park. Soc. pp. 364—8, especially Chapter 7. In an earlier part of his book he expressly adverts to this passage of the Communion office and writes as follows: "and therefore in the Book of the Holy Communion we do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may be the body and blood of Christ; but that they may be to us the body and blood of Christ, that is to say: that we may so eat them and drink that we may be partakers of his body crucified and of his blood shed for our redemption." Ibid. p. 271.

SARUM.

most excellent cup into His holy and venerable hands, and likewise giving thanks unto Thee, He bless + ed, and gave to His disciples, saying, take and drink ye all of this, for this is the cup of my blood of the new and everlasting Testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. As often as ye do (*or offer*) these things, ye shall do them in memory of me.

1549.

when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new Testament which is shed for you and for many for remission of sins. Do this as oft you shall drink it in remembrance of me ¹.

¹ The form of words of institution in the Book of 1549 is quite different from that hitherto in use in England. It is of importance to enquire whence the new form was derived. In the very commencement there is a change. The roman begins "On the day before"; the new book has "In the same night that". It has been suggested that this was derived from the Mozarabic missal, but in the absence of any definite proof of this origin it is more natural to suppose that both are taken from the words of St. Paul.

A recent writer has called attention to the "composite character of our formula", and it really is even more composite than would appear from his account. He adds: "It is very remarkable how closely it resembles that of the old spanish liturgy both in language and simplicity. It is difficult to think that the one is not derived immediately from the other" (Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica* 2nd ed. pp. 600—1). There is however another recital of Institution with which that of 1549 should be compared. It is to be found in a book mentioned by some writers as one source of the Book of Common Prayer, and in great measure

SARUM.

Wherefore also we Thy
servants O Lord and also
Thy holy people, in mem-

1549.

Wherefore O Lord and
heavenly Father, accord-
ing to the institution of

the compilation of Osiander to whom Cranmer was well known. It discloses precisely the same composite form as that adopted in the English Book of 1549, and whilst the Mozarabic presents obvious substantial differences this shows only some slight divergences of construction.

Taking into account both the identity of form and the circumstances of connection there can be no doubt that the words of Institution in the Book of Common Prayer were derived from the Lutheran liturgy of Brandenburg-Nuremberg. Only one clause, "when he had blessed", does not appear in the German form of Institution. Many reformers felt a difficulty in translating the word *benedicere* in St. Matthew and St. Mark by "bless." They preferred to treat it as equivalent to the "giving thanks" of St. Luke and St. Paul. Thus Tyndall translates it in St. Matthew as "gave thanks" and in St. Mark as "blessed." Cranmer in his translation changes both into "when he had given thanks." The origin of this dislike for the literal translation may be best explained in the words of Ridley. "Innocentius, a bishop of Rome of the latter days, and Duns do attribute this work (i. e. transubstantiation) unto the word *benedixit* 'he blessed'" (*Works* Parker Soc. p. 26 cf. also pp. 16—17) and the opinion had been "lately renewed now in our days" (Becon *Prayers* &c. Park. Soc. III 269). A great stress was laid on the word by those who maintained the old opinions. "Worcester (Heath) said once to me" writes Latimer "that to offer was contained in *benedicere*, which is not true, for *benedicere* is to give thanks" (*Works*, Park. Soc. p. 111). The wording of the Prayer Book is almost certainly the result of a compromise, if that can fitly be called a compromise, where one side had to yield in almost every matter and had to put the best, even if a strained, interpretation on what remained. In the Prayer Book of 1552 the words "blessed and" are left out and have not since been restored. For a comparison of the various forms see Appendix vi.

SARUM.

ory as well of the *blessed passion* of the same Christ, thy Son, our Lord, as of His *resurrection* from the dead, *and* also of His *glorious ascension* into the heavens do offer unto Thy excellent majesty, of *thine own gifts*, albeit given unto us, a pure + victim, a holy + victim, an undefiled + victim, the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation. Upon which do thou vouchsafe to look with favourable and gracious countenance and hold them accepted, as thou did vouchsafe to hold accepted the offerings of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and that holy sacrifice, the pure offering, which the high priest Melchisedech did offer unto Thee.

1549.

Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesu Christ, *we Thy humble servants*, do celebrate and make here before Thy divine Majesty with these *Thy holy gifts* the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make: *having in remembrance His blessed passion, mighty resurrection and glorious ascension*,

rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this

SARUM.

1549.

*We humbly beseech
Thee Almighty God,
command that these things
be brought up by the hands*

*our sacrifice of praise*¹
and thanksgiving: most
humbly beseeching Thee
to grant that by the
merits and death of thy
Son Jesu Christ and
through faith in His blood
we and all Thy whole
church may obtain re-
mission of our sins and all
other benefits of His pas-
sion. And here we offer
and present unto Thee
(O Lord) ourselves, our
souls and bodies to be a
reasonable, holy and
lively sacrifice unto Thee:
*humbly beseeching Thee*²,

¹ The *Sacrifice of praise* is thus explained by Cranmer: "another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God; but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God and to show ourselves thankful unto him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise and thanksgiving"... By this kind of sacrifice "we offer ourselves and all that we have unto Him and His Father". (Park. Soc. Cranmer's *Writings on the Lord's Supper* p. 346). The "Sacrifice of praise" of the ancient canon (p. 201 *ante*) means, it is clear, something quite different.

² Although in what follows there is similarity of words, this cannot be represented by italics because, as will be seen on comparison, the whole idea is changed in the direction pointed out in note 1, pag. 205 *ante*.

SARUM.

of Thy holy Angel, to thy altar on high before the sight of Thy divine Majesty that as many of us as by this partaking of the altar shall have received the most sacred bo + dy and bl + ood of Thy Son, may be fulfilled with all heavenly bene + diction and grace, through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

1549.

that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy Son Jesus Christ that He may dwell in them and they in Him. And although we be unworthy through our manifold sins to offer unto Thee any sacrifice yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service¹, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy angels to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle, before the sight of Thy divine Majesty;

Remember also, *O Lord*,

¹ This seems to be suggested by the *oblatio servitutis nostrae* p. 203 *ante* where, according to the Sarum rubric, the priest is to "look at the host with great reverence". What follows is merely a late gloss of an admittedly difficult and mysterious portion of the canon (Hoppe, p. 105—6).

SARUM.

1549.

*the souls of Thy servants
and handmaidens N, which
have gone before us with
the sign of faith, and sleep,
in the sleep of peace; grant
unto them we beseech thee
O Lord, and to all that rest
in Christ, a place of re-
freshing, light and peace;
through the same Christ,
our Lord. Amen.*

Unto us sinners also,
Thy servants, that hope
in the multitude of Thy
mercies, vouchsafe to
grant some part and
fellowship with Thy holy
apostles and martyrs, with
John, Stephen, Matthias,
Barnabas, Ignatius, Alex-
ander, Marcellinus, Peter,
Felicitas, Perpetua, Aga-
tha, Lucy, Agnes, Caecilia,
Anastasia, and with all
Thy saints, unto whose
company do Thou admit
us,

*not weighing our merits,
but freely pardoning our
offences, we beseech Thee
through Christ our Lord,
by whom all these good
[gifts] Thou, O Lord, ever
createst, sancti + fies, +
filles + with life, bless +*

*not weighing our merits,
but pardoning our offences,
through Christ our Lord;*

SARUM.

est and bestowest upon us.

By + Him and with + Him and in + Him is unto Thee, God the Father Almighty, in the unity of the Holy Ghost all honour and glory, world without end, Amen.

1549.

by whom and with whom in the unity of the Holy Ghost all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end, Amen.

To persons in some measure familiar with the foreign service books of the reformation period many points of resemblance both in sequence of idea and turn of expression will be suggested by the canon of the new Prayer Book. Such resemblances hardly admit of demonstration and may be here disregarded. One observation however may be allowed. To a man like Cranmer, who must have been in the habit of saying his mass daily for more than thirty years, the prayers of the ancient canon would have become part of the very texture of his mind and presented themselves unbidden. It is only therefore to be expected, apart from all question of intention, that in the new service book recollections of the old forms should continually appear. And this may help perhaps to explain in some measure the recurrence of familiar phrases used to introduce passages quite alien to the ideas expressed in the ancient canon, and suggested, it would seem, rather by similarity of position in the services, than by similarity of feeling or any desire to preserve the old forms.

(10) In the book of 1549 the prayer of consecration is immediately followed by the Lord's Prayer as in the Roman liturgy since the time of St. Gregory. The ancient preface to it is however altered and the so called *embolismus*, which is an expansion of

the last petition: "deliver us from evil," is left out altogether. The reason for this omission is not certain, but one result is that the "fraction" of the host which took place during this prayer is also left out of the Prayer Book.¹

The service at once proceeds to the *Pax Domini*, "The peace of the Lord be always with you."

(11) At this point an inversion of the Sarum rite occurs. In the ancient use there follows immediately the *Agnus Dei* and then the ritual action called the 'commixture' with its accompanying prayer. In the book of 1549 this "commixture" is left out altogether and in place of the prayer a new composition entirely different in idea is substituted.² The *Agnus* is removed to the time of the communion of the people.³

(12) From this point to the conclusion of the service the Book of 1549 practically leaves the missal entirely and adopts the Order of Communion of 1548.⁴ A few alterations are made and additions introduced which are not without significance. Thus:

¹ Of the various actions which constitute the ritual preparation for the communion "the most nearly universal are the *fraction* and *commixture*... The former of these two rites is distinct from the breaking which takes place for the purpose of distribution and the latter is not to be confounded with the 'intinction', a purely oriental rite, which is necessary to the oriental method of administering the two species combined" (Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* p. xxxiv).

² On *commixture* cf. the preceding note.

³ In the ancient roman rite the *Agnus* was sung during the fraction of the host, not as at present after it. The *Agnus* of course was not originally recited by the priest. When this practice grew up, the matter being one of perfect indifference, the *Agnus* was inserted either before (e. g. at Sarum) or after (e. g. at Rome) the prayer for the commixture.

⁴ The compilers were probably determined to this course by

the form of absolution which in 1548 declared that "Our Blessed Lord hath left power to his Church to absolve penitent sinners from their sins" now is couched in general and indefinite terms, all mention of the Church being omitted. A change also in the last rubric for the communion, ¹ substituting "the Sacrament of the body" and "the Sacrament of the blood" for "the bread" and "the wine" is a result of Bonner's protest against heresy.

(13) After the communion of the people is ended a verse of Holy Scripture is directed to be sung "called the postcommunion".²

(14) Finally a new invariable prayer is introduced before the blessing, the first words of which are an adaptation of the Sarum prayer said by the priest immediately after communion.³

the general character of the prayers which preceded the communion in the missal. These were of late mediæval introduction and some of those in the Sarum, which are not found in the Roman, emphasize aspects of Eucharistic doctrine specially distasteful to Cranmer and his friends, e. g. "Deus Pater, fons et origo totius bonitatis, qui ductus misericordia Unigenitum Tuum pro nobis ad infima mundi descendere et carnem sumere voluisti, quam ego indignus hic in manibus meis teneo (*rubric*: hic inclinatur se sacerdos ad hostiam, dicens). Te adoro" &c. Or again: "Ave in æternum sanctissima caro Christi" &c. This last invocation has been for the last three centuries traditionally continued in Catholic prayer books but transferred to the time of the elevation.

¹ P. p. 92 G. p. 206.

² This is a change of name. In the ancient rite as in the present missal the variable *verse of Scripture* was called the *communio* and it is the variable *prayer* which follows which is named the *postcommunio*. This prayer is discarded in the new service.

³ "*Qui me refecisti de sacratissimo corpore et sanguine*" of the old prayer is changed into: "Thou hast vouchsafed to feed

The service ended with the blessing which still concludes the Communion office in the present Prayer Book.

us in these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of Thy most precious body and blood”.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1549 AND CONTEMPORARY LITURGIES.

The Communion office "commonly called the mass" is the chief element in determining the character of the new Prayer Book, and although the undue prominence which has in fact been given to the morning and evening prayer during the past three centuries has somewhat obscured this central act of Christian worship, its importance will hardly be now called in question, and in the middle of the sixteenth century it could not have been doubted.

In the last chapter, the Communion office has been contrasted with the traditional service of Catholic England, which it was intended to supersede. Here will be pointed out the relation it bore to similar liturgies which had their origin in the religious movements of that century. The labours of several generations of scholars have issued in the classification, more or less accurate, of extant liturgies, eastern and western, and they have been arranged into certain groups or "families". It is important to enquire to what "family" the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 belongs, and to understand whether it is to be ranked with the ancient liturgies of the Christian church or with the group of church

services created by the Reformation in the sixteenth century ¹.

It has already been contrasted with the Sarum mass which may be taken as a type of those in use in the western Church. The result of the examination may be briefly summed up as follows: speaking generally and taking no account of ceremonial, the new office of 1549 may be said to agree with the ancient mass as far as the creed inclusively. At this point there is an interpolation, which partakes of the nature of a homily. Then there is a gap where the old ritual of oblation had been; the mass is resumed for the Preface; but a new prayer of consecration is substituted for the old Canon. Of the rest of the ancient mass only the Lord's Prayer, the *Pax Domini* and the *Agnus* survive, the rest being entirely new.

The liturgies created by the Reformation fall naturally into two classes: the Lutheran and the Reformed. Of these it is evident that only the former need be taken into consideration in the present connection. For although it is possible to trace in places a certain similarity of thought and expression, the general character of the "reformed" liturgies is quite different from the Anglican office of 1549, since it is a principle of the reformed liturgies to obliterate as far as possible every trace of the ancient mass. The case is otherwise with the liturgies of the Lutheran churches; which

¹ It is of course only possible in a work like this to indicate generally the sources whence the material for the Book of Common Prayer is drawn. If a correct knowledge of the principles on which it was compiled is to be obtained, an annotated edition of the two Books of 1549 and 1552 is necessary, in which the sources, ascertained on a comprehensive survey of contemporary as well as traditional liturgies, are given in detail according to the methods usually employed in such investigations.

must be considered in dealing with this matter ¹.

At the outset of the enquiry it is necessary to note that the present practice of these churches does not represent what was usual among them in the middle of the sixteenth century. The Thirty years war which devastated Germany in the first half of the seventeenth century was fatal to their observance, although long afterwards there existed a remarkable survival of the ancient Catholic rites in the Lutheran churches which forms a striking contrast to all that prevailed in England, even after the reform of Laud, until within recent years ².

¹ In speaking of the Lutheran liturgies those of the genuine type, that is, of Northern Germany, are meant. A general knowledge of the whole range of Lutheran services may be easily gained even by those who have no access to great libraries through the collection of Richter *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*, whilst the work of Kliefoth is a guide and continuous commentary. These early *orders* are full of details which throw light on the popular use of the liturgy at the close of the middle ages.

² In cathedral churches in particular, a great part of the Catholic services remained to a late period intact. The Wittenberg programme in regard to services in monasteries and greater churches is explained in Bugenhagen's Pomeranian order of 1535 (Richter, I p. 259). He drew up at the same time a scheme in detail for the canonical hours which two years later he forwarded to Henry VIII, but that king's views in regard to the monasteries were different. This scheme involved the continuance of the ancient sunday and ferial office in latin, practically unaltered except by curtailment of matins and the introduction of german collects. It was in fact carried out in several cathedral and collegiate churches, even to comparatively recent years. Such books as the Magdeburg (noted) *Cantica Sacra* (*i. e.* Antiphonar) published in 1613, or the Halberstadt Breviary (undated) of about the year 1791, give an idea of what was done. So far as they go they are word for word the mediæval books of these churches and very few changes

The basis of the very numerous liturgies which appeared in the sixteenth century among the Lutherans was either the so called "latin mass" put forth by Luther in 1523, or his subsequent "german mass" of 1526, or a combination of both. These "masses" were in fact merely a body of liturgical directions which assumed the existence of the old missals and their continued use, except in so far as they were distinctly abrogated¹.

In the beginning of his "latin mass" Luther laid down the principles upon which he proceeded in his liturgical reforms, and to which he remained constant during life. His intention, he declares, was to purge the form of worship in actual use which had been corrupted, and to set forth a godly use. "For" he continues "we cannot deny that mass and the communion of bread and wine is a rite divinely instituted by Christ".² Consequently he allows the mass as it stood in the ancient missals, especially for sundays, as consonant with primitive purity, except what concerns the offertory and the "abominable canon".³ His great grievance against the mass is that it has been turned into a sacrifice.

occur even in the offices for the saints' days retained. The Magdeburg book is valuable as giving the local chant for every part of the office and in fact holds the place of a mediæval antiphonar and gradual. The Halberstadt breviary continued in use until the year 1810. To any one unacquainted with the details these volumes might easily pass for Catholic office books.

¹ See for instance the Saxon order of 1539 drawn up by Justus Jonas in Richter, I. 315 and the Halle order of 1541. *ibid.* p. 340.

² Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, vol. II, p. 81.

³ "Loquor autem de Canone illo lacero et abominabili ex multorum laciniis seu sentina collecto, ibi cœpit missa fieri sacrificium, ibi addita offertoria" &c. Daniel *ut sup.* p. 82.

In a writing of the year 1530 he expresses his satisfaction that so much of praise and thanksgiving has remained in the mass, as the *Gloria in excelsis*, the Alleluia, the Creed, the Preface, the *Sanctus*, the *Agnus Dei*, in which pieces there is nothing of sacrifice but mere praise and thanksgiving. "Wherefore we also" he says "retain them in our mass". He considers the *Agnus Dei* especially appropriate for the time of communion. He sums up the case in the one expression, that what is evil in the mass, as savouring of oblation and the *opus operatum*, is what the priest alone recites secretly.¹

Luther's scheme for reforming the ancient mass is developed as follows:

(1) Notice is to be given by those intending to communicate.²

(2) The vestments hitherto in use are allowed to continue.

(3) (4) The mass is to begin with the introit,³

¹ See Jacoby, *Liturgik der Reformatoren* I. p. 129.

² Daniel, II. p. 92. The object is that the pastor may know the names and "life" of intending communicants. The explanation given by Luther at length as to the intention of this provision (*ibid.* p. 93) corresponds with the similar direction contained in the second and third rubrics prefixed to the communion office in the Book of Common Prayer.

³ The *Confiteor* which in the old rite had been said at the commencement of mass by the priest was from the Lutheran standpoint regarded as a sacerdotal preparation for the sacrifice, and was therefore omitted. The attempt to restore it under the *Interim* gave great offence. In place of it the *Kirchenordnungen* give simple directions for the preparation of the altar, the vesting of the priest, and that he should then take his place devoutly and humbly before the altar and begin the service. The omission of the *Confiteor* in the Prayer Book of 1549 is the more noteworthy inasmuch as it, or an equivalent is allowed in the Bran-

which he preserves in its old form; although "we should prefer" he says "that the whole psalm from which they are taken were sung as formerly".¹

(5) Then follow the Kyrie, *Gloria in excelsis*, the old collects, "provided they are pious, as nearly all those for sundays are", the Epistle, the Gradual, provided it is short, the Gospel² and the Nicene Creed.³

(6) As regards the sermon, he leaves discretion about its position in the service, whether after the creed or before the commencement of the mass.

(7) "There follows all that abomination called the *offertory*. And from this point almost everything stinks of oblation. Therefore casting aside all that savours of oblation with the entire canon, let us keep those things which are pure and holy." At the end of the sermon therefore, or after the creed,⁴ there is sung a german psalm or hymn during which the communicants go into the choir, the men going

denburg-Nuremberg order of 1533 and in the *Pia consultatio* of Hermann of Cologne. (See Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen* viii p. 6. seqq.).

¹ Daniel p. 83. As a matter of fact this was never acted on. Luther withdrew his proposal and in practice the old introits were taken over as they stood. (Kliefoth, viii p. 14).

² The old salutation *Dominus vobiscum* and the *Gloria tibi Domine* before the Gospel are generally discarded in the Lutheran uses as expressly in the Prayer Book of 1549. (Kliefoth, viii. p. 33). In the same way the old ceremonial connected with the reading of the Gospel was entirely swept away.

³ Daniel &c. p. 85. At this point Daniel reads "Symbolum Nicenum cantari solitum displicet" omitting the important word *non*. See the correct text in Richter I. p. 3.

⁴ Luther deals with this portion of the service in two separate places of his tract. In order to see what was done it is necessary here to have recourse to the liturgies themselves.

to the right hand and the women to the left¹. Here the priest prepares the bread and wine and places them on the altar.² During the time a collection for the poor was sometimes made.³

(8) This preparation being finished the priest takes up the order of the mass again, with the salutation: "The Lord be with you" and proceeds with the familiar "Lift up your hearts" followed by the Preface. The greater part of the ancient Prefaces were retained as they stood in the old missals.

(9) The canon was reduced to a mere recital of the words of Institution pronounced aloud. Then was sung the Sanctus⁴ and whilst the words "Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord" were sung the host and chalice were to be elevated.⁵

¹ See Luther's mass: Daniel pp. 93—4, where he develops his reasons for the separation of the communicants from the non-communicants, the former according to his teaching coöperating in the *whole act* of the supper and giving by their separation a public confession of faith. The time and method of this separation, which was a break from tradition, was adopted in the first Prayer Book.

² Luther declares that his mind is not made up as to the use of the "mixed chalice"; but he inclines to the use of wine only. In practice the mixed chalice although allowed to be ancient was from doctrinal considerations disused by the Lutherans (Kliefoth, viii pp. 77—8).

³ See Kliefoth, viii pp. 54—9.

⁴ This separation of the Preface and Sanctus, proposed in 1523, was soon abandoned by Luther himself and, with the exception of two orders of the year 1525, the old arrangement was everywhere maintained. (Kliefoth, viii pp. 84—5.)

⁵ The *elevation* is still prescribed in the Wittenberg order of 1533. From a letter of Luther in 1539 it appears he had already given it up; but it remained commonly in use after the *roman* fashion elsewhere in Northern Germany. In 1543 he expresses his readiness to resume it if it were useful, and still thinks that

(10) The Lord's Prayer with the usual short preface follows; but Luther directs that the *embolismus* should be omitted, as well as the fraction of the host and that the *Pax Domini* should immediately follow.

(11) The ritual commixture is omitted, and

(12) The communion of priest and people immediately follows, the priest having the discretion of saying one of the preparatory prayers in the missal.¹ The formula of administration to the people Luther leaves unchanged, but they are to receive under both kinds and the *Agnus* is to be sung during the administration.

(13) After this a verse of Holy Scripture, the *Communio* of the old missals, may be sung. But the last collect or postcommunion "because it is suggestive almost always of sacrifice" is to be omitted.

(14) Luther suggested a new and invariable prayer in the place which corresponds to the "thanksgiving" prayer at the end of the communion office of 1549.

The service ended with the blessing.

On reviewing this office it will be seen that the terms of comparison already used in contrasting the english communion service of 1549 with the ancient mass, hold good in every point except one. Luther swept away the canon altogether and retained only the essential words of Institution. Cranmer substituted a new prayer of about the same length as the old canon, leaving in it a few shreds of the ancient one, but divesting it of its character of

in itself it is not a dangerous practice, and, although to assert his Christian freedom he had dispensed with it, yet he allows others to continue it if they please. Its disuse was to a great extent caused by the discussions consequent on the Interim. (See Kliefoth, VIII pp. 104—6 and Jacoby, *Liturgik der Reformatoren* I pp. 297—8).

¹ The first beginning "Domine Jesu Christe".

sacrifice and oblation. Even the closest theological scrutiny of the new composition will not detect anything inconsistent with, or excluding, Luther's negation of the sacrificial idea of the mass.¹

Looking therefore at the characteristics of the new Anglican service and contrasting it on the one hand with the ancient missal and on the other with the Lutheran liturgies, there can be no hesitation whatever in classing it with the latter, not with the former;² and passing from the Communion office to consider the other sacramental rites this affinity will still be found to exist.

In the order of Public Baptism for example hardly more than one fourth part of the new office can be referred to the baptismal service of the ancient rituals. The *Consultatio* of Hermann of Cologne, a quasi-Lutheran production of Bucer and Melancthon³ is

¹ It is interesting to observe the impression made by the book of 1549 among the Lutherans in Leipsic as reported by Aless in the preface to his translation. After lamenting the dissensions among the reformers, their undue insistence each on his own foible and the suspicious fear with which each regarded an observance different from his own, he specifies, besides one or two matters of small import, the two objections made around him against the book. One is indicated in vague terms but evidently stigmatizes the retention of a canon (Bucer, *Scripta Anglicana* p. 374). The other point of offence was the prohibition of the elevation of the sacrament after it had been consecrated. In such matters Aless pleads for liberty and he refers cavillers on this and other such matters to the divine justice. (*Ibid.* p. 375).

² As Kliefoth remarks: "Nur grosse Unkenntniss der Geschichte und Gestalt der mittelalterlichen Liturgie hat meinen können diese in der Liturgie der anglicanischen Kirche wieder zu finden." (vol. vii p. 6).

³ In the year 1543, when the *Pia Consultatio* was drawn up, Melancthon had advanced a stage beyond the pure Wittenberg doctrine. (As to the development of his ideas on the Eucharist

commonly suggested as the source of much of the rest. This to a certain extent is true, but in the *Consultatio* the baptismal office is divided into two sections said on successive days, and the general order and disposition of parts is very different from that in the Anglican office, which much more closely resembles the second ritual of baptism put forth by Luther in 1524. Some not inconsiderable portions are apparently original; and throughout the whole office it is impossible not to recognize an utter indifference to ancient english traditions.¹ Changes at times appear to have been made gratuitously:

see Frank *Die Theologie der Concordienformel* III, p. 5—28 and relative notes). The only portion of interest in the book for the Anglican liturgy is the second half, which represents Bucer's particular share in the work. Though employing Lutheran forms he had with his usual skill inserted Strasburg doctrine. He rightly judged that the work would be welcomed by those who shared Helvetic views about the Sacrament. It was however only at the most earnest entreaties of Bucer's friend the Landgrave of Hesse that Luther was restrained from stigmatizing the *Pia consultatio* along with the works of Zwingli and Œcolampadius.

No single book gives the details of its history. Drouven (*Die Reformation in der kölnischen Kirchenprovinz*, 1876) supplies the best material for the successive stages of its compilation and the disputes with the Chapter of Cologne about it. Varrentrapp's *Hermann von Wied* (1878) gives many notices which are not found in Drouven. The second volume of Lenz's *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer* furnishes the very important letters to Bullinger and Blaurer, which show how perfectly Bucer appreciated the character of the book and how correct was Luther's judgment of it. A few further details are supplied in Kuyper's *Opera Joannis à Lasco* II. 574, 582, 591—2. Hardenberg's life in 1544—5 is also bound up with the history of this book.

¹ The provisions for "dipping" the child are, however, an evident imitation of the curious rubric of the Sarum ritual.

thus according to the english practice the Gospel read in the service was taken from St. Matthew; Luther adopted from his ancient local rituals the parallel passage from St. Mark, and this has been transferred to the english baptismal service.¹

The service "Of them that be baptized in private houses in time of necessity" offers several subjects for remark. The rubrics, enquiries and certificate, up to the point of the recital of the Gospel, are derived from the *Pia consultatio* of Hermann. Attention has been called to the great superiority of the anglican to the foreign formula. "The former is simple and forcible in its style, the later tediously copious and diffuse"². This is true so far as the latin translation (1545) of the *Consultatio* is concerned, but the remark does not hold good of the german original of 1543, which is as concise and pithy as the anglican. Moreover in this short section the german of 1543 differs from the latin in at least half a dozen substantial particulars. In each of these cases

¹ In this very composite order the proportions of the component parts may be roughly given as follows: Out of about 250 lines (including rubric) between 70 and 80 at most are taken from the elaborate and lengthy office of the old english rituals. This includes one whole prayer, also to be found in Luther's service; in the book of 1549 it has a position similar to that in Luther's book, but in the Sarum ritual it is found in quite another place and connection. With the exception of this single prayer the rest of the Sarum material is scattered about in shreds throughout the whole office. The bulk of the new office is apparently original or derived from the books of Luther and Hermann. It would be impossible to show the details except by printing the offices in parallel columns.

² See Bulley, *Communion and baptismal offices* p. viii. It may be well to observe that the english translation issued in 1547 and 1548, was made from the latin version, not from the original german.

the Book of 1549 follows the german, which there can be no doubt is its immediate source. ¹

According to the ancient practice children who had received private baptism were to be brought to church in order that the ceremonies, which had been necessarily omitted, might be supplied. According to the new rubric, derived from the german, this was now to be done "to the intent that the priest might examine and try whether the child be lawfully baptized or no". In accordance with this change of object, the important ceremonies of exorcism and unction, prescribed even in the book of 1549 for public baptism, are left out, whilst the white vesture or *chrisom*, a mere antiquarian survival, which the rubrics of the old ritual and of the book of 1549 both show to have been a source of abuse and superstition, is retained.

In the same way the influence of the Lutheran spirit is evidenced in the service for confirmation. Into this the idea of a public profession of faith on coming to years of discretion is introduced which finds no counterpart in the ancient rite. ² Moreover

¹ Two examples may suffice. The rubric before the certificate runs "then shall not be christen the child again, *but shall receive him as one of the flock of the true Christian people.*" There is nothing corresponding to the italicised words in the latin; but the german runs: "so soll es der Pastor, nicht wider tenffen sonder . . . es da in die gemein und zal der rechtschaffē Christen annemen" (fol. LXXXVIII a).

The certificate in the latin is very long, resembles the german only in the beginning, and turns on wholly different considerations. The english in the Book of Common Prayer exactly follows the german. It may be observed that the original german order in the Cologne book is taken almost word for word from Justus Jonas' Saxon order of 1539.

² This new turn given to the rite of confirmation explains the insertion of the catechism under that heading. In the Lutheran

complicated as the history of this Sacrament¹ is, one thing is clear from the testimony of antiquity, that confirmation is emphatically the "*sacramentum chrismatis*", whilst in the new book of 1549 the chrism was done away with altogether. The outward acts of crossing were retained but the substance of the ceremony is made to consist in the laying on of hands, as among the Lutherans.

In the three great rites of the First Book of Common Prayer, therefore, unmistakable proof of Lutheran influence is found. The reduction of the daily service to matins and evensong and the general order of the services themselves afford other evidence. Any attentive examination of the early Lutheran liturgies will disclose resemblances in minor matters between them and the book of 1549 which cannot be accidental. And even if it were not an ascertained fact that, during the year when it was in preparation, Cranmer was under the influence of his Lutheran friends, the testimony of the book itself would be sufficient to prove beyond doubt that it was conceived and drawn up after the Lutheran pattern.²

churches confirmation was regarded as the ending of catechetical instruction when the pastor by imposition of hands admitted the neophyte to full Christian communion (See Daniel, II p. 274—5).

¹ This is discussed with learning and ingenuity, and from a standpoint which cannot be considered favourable to Catholic practice, in the first volume of Höfling's *Sacrament der Taufe*. Neale's more restricted account (*Introduction* p. 999 seqq.) is best understood after Höfling.

² The fact is perhaps somewhat obscured by the manner in which Lutheran liturgies are framed. They do not give at length what was taken from the ancient service books: the varying collects, the epistles, gospels, introits, graduals, communions or the fixed parts of the *Ordo Missæ* which Luther retained. At the same time many of them incorporate theoretical discussions or

This conclusion is based on an analysis and comparison of texts only. But it is amply confirmed on a view of the historical circumstances. The younger Justus Jonas, an inmate of Cranmer's house and his friend may naturally be supposed to be prejudiced in favour of the Wittenbergers.¹ But the statement of a contemporary, well qualified in every way to form a judgment on the subject, is precise. Richard Hilles writing to Bullinger from London on 1st June 1549 says: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom; but after the manner of the Nuremberg churches and some of those in Saxony".²

It has been already seen that at the end of July 1548, the friends of the Helvetian reformers contrasted the attitude of Cranmer to their views unfavourably with that of Latimer and they imply that the archbishop preferred the society of Lutherans to that of the more advanced reformers.³ To their astonishment

practical directions which have little or nothing to do with liturgy proper.

¹ According to Laurence (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 16 note) the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, possesses a copy of volumes 1 and 2 of Luther's works with Cranmer's signature and a note saying that these were given to the archbishop in 1548 (the year of the composition of the Prayer Book) by "*Justus Jonas Jun.*" The younger Justus Jonas was only 21 at this time but he was already versed in the discussions of the period. Melancthon took him as his companion on his journey to Cologne to settle the *Pia consultatio* with Bucer.

² *Orig. Letters*. Parker Soc. p. 266. The writer had lived for many years at Strasburg where the keenest interest was taken in every movement both of the Lutheran and the Helvetian churches. He would have been well able to place the new Prayer Book in its proper "family."

³ *Orig. Letters*. p. 320.

and delight however, in the debate in parliament, Cranmer took up a doctrinal standpoint coincident with their own. The change has been attributed by some to the influence of Latimer, by others to that of Ridley, by others again to the society of à Lasco, but it is probable that it was due to a combination of influences.

The conversion of the archbishop to the advanced doctrines of the Helvetian school of reformers had long been prepared for in the mind of Bullinger. He rightly felt that the key to the religious position in England was Cranmer's mind, and that to establish an influence over it would be to transfer the weight of his paramount authority in the ecclesiastical government from the Lutherans to themselves.

As early as June 1548 Bullinger was anxiously looking for news. He enquires eagerly from Richard Hilles the whereabouts of à Lasco. He has forwarded, he says, to Cranmer a book accompanied by a letter exhorting the archbishop to a due performance of his episcopal duties and in which by subtle transition he proceeded to treat of the Eucharist. Early in August he writes to Burcher, the partner of Hilles at Strasburg, asking information about the state of England, and for further tidings of John à Lasco. At the same time he desires to know whether his book and letter had been duly forwarded to Cranmer.

Bullinger's enquiries about à Lasco were evidently dictated by impatience at his delay in accepting Cranmer's invitation to come over into England. He understood the influence which à Lasco would be likely to exercise over a mind so ductile as that of the archbishop, and hoped through his means to draw him from the "dangerous lethargy" of his Lutheranism. The Polish reformer arrived in England

at the end of September (1548) and for the next six months lived with the archbishop, and was thus able in person to enforce the doctrine which Bullinger could only convey by letter. The publication of Cranmer's Lutheran catechism in the summer of this same year (1548) filled the mind of Bullinger with disquietude. In November he again writes to Hilles, who was now in London, for further information "how the archbishop of Canterbury received" his letter and book. But before this message could have reached England, Bullinger's disciple John ab Ulmis was enabled to convey to him the welcome intelligence that "even that Thomas himself about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that upright and judicious man master John à Lasco is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy" ¹.

Although this assertion may have been too absolute and exclusive, there seems no reason to doubt that there was sufficient truth in it to justify Bullinger's anxiety that à Lasco should be with Cranmer. The change in the archbishop's mind certainly took place soon after the Pole's arrival in England and was to that form of doctrine represented by Bullinger, ² and Hooper, Bullinger's intimate friend, was

¹ *Orig. Letters*, p. 383. Traheron writing from London 28 September had already informed Bullinger "that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans." (*Ibid.* p. 322). Traheron was probably somewhat premature although there were indications of the change.

² See *Orig. Letters*: pp. 17, 262, 266, 380, 383, 641. Canon Dixon describes Bullinger as a "moderate Lutheran". This was not the case as may be seen by his attitude towards the very

certainly of opinion that Cranmer's continuance in the right path largely depended upon à Lasco's presence¹.

Notwithstanding the triumph of those who now held sway over Cranmer's mind at the line which he took in the discussions preceding the introduction of the act of Uniformity, the book which the act imposed on the church was extremely distasteful to them. Hooper in writing to Bullinger describes it as "very defective and of doubtful construction and in some respects indeed manifestly impious"².

Francis Dryander, "Greek Professor" at Cambridge, who cordially agreed with his master Bullinger in

moderate form of Lutheranism which found its way into Berne. In contrast with so many other reformers Bullinger is consistent with himself throughout in his doctrine of the Eucharist, and his honesty comes out in striking contrast to the want of straightforwardness which characterised many incidents in Bucer's career. At this very time (1548) Bullinger was arranging with Calvin the Zurich *consensus* (of which the cardinal article was that of the "Supper") which fixed definitely the doctrine of the Helvetic churches. Canon Dixon's mistake perhaps came from crediting the assertion sometimes made that Bullinger assented to the Wittenberg *Concordia* of 1536. This was not really so. For an account of the whole transaction see Pestalozzi's *Heinrich Bullinger*, p. 194 seqq.

¹ *Orig. Letters* p. 161. Cranmer's letter to Melancthon of 10 Feb. 1549 urging him also to come to England is proof of the trust he placed in à Lasco. "I could relate many things upon this subject which would bring you over to our opinion (as to the utility of Melancthon's coming), but the brevity of a letter will not contain them all. I would rather, therefore, that you should learn them from the bearer, John à Lasco, a most excellent man. For he has resided with me upon most intimate and friendly terms for some months past; and I pray you to give credit to whatever he may relate to you in my name". (*Ibid.* p. 22.)

² *Ibid.* p. 79.

his religious opinions, passes upon the new service book a more measured judgment. "A compendium of it written in latin" he writes "I send to master Vadian on the condition of his communicating it to you. You will see that the summary of doctrine cannot be found fault with, although certain ceremonies are retained in that book which may appear useless and perhaps hurtful, unless a candid interpretation be put upon them. But in the cause of religion which is the most important of all in the whole world, I think that every kind of deception either by ambiguity or trickery of language is altogether unwarrantable. You will also find something to blame in the matter of the Lord's Supper, for the book speaks very obscurely, and however you may try to explain it with candour, you cannot avoid great absurdity. The reason is, the bishops could not for a long time agree among themselves respecting this article" ¹.

In fact, so far as Cranmer himself was concerned, the first Book of Common Prayer, as a whole, represented a stage in his opinions which he had already passed before the discussion in parliament. This change can only be detected in the book itself by marking the care taken to employ turns of expression which should not clash with his new views. And although the archbishop speaks with sufficient definiteness in his subsequent treatises on the Eucharist, his common-place books, from which he drew his material, bear sufficient evidence of his embarrassment how to reconcile those views with the writings of the Fathers. ²

¹ Ibid pp. 350—1.

² Royal MS. 7 B XI. It is rarely that such an opportunity is afforded of gauging the difficulties of the controversialist in dealing with untoward materials as is supplied by a comparison of Cranmer's common-place book with his published book on the Sacrament of 1550.

The fact that Cranmer had already gone beyond his own work before it was imposed rendered easy and probable a future revision of a yet more radical kind. To this his new friends now looked forward, and of it some promise is even contained in the book itself ¹.

That the Prayer Book, before it had begun to be used was really regarded in Lambeth itself as merely a temporary stage in the development of the reformation, is clear from the letter which Bucer and Paul Fagius addressed to their former colleagues at Strasburg. In this they communicate their first impressions gathered on their arrival at the archbishop's house, where they remained for the next six months before proceeding to the work found for them at Cambridge. "We yesterday" they say "waited upon the archbishop of Canterbury, that most benevolent and kind father of the churches and of godly men; who received and entertained us as brethren,

The underlining and marginal notes tell a curious tale. The words *vinum* and *panis* are eagerly emphasized at fol. 78 and at fol. 79 "Dionysius sanctum panem vocat ante consecrationem." Fol. 80 seqq. show abundant notes such as these on SS. Leo, Cyril, Hilary, Chrysostom &c. "Christus simul in cælo et in sacramento" — "Ipsam carnem comedimus" — "Christus per sacramentum inhabitat nos corporaliter," &c. The interest of these volumes does not depend on the question how much or how little is in Cranmer's hand. They were undoubtedly the books he used. The C. C. C. C. MS. 102 ff. 155—193 comprises his further working notes in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist, and are still more interesting as being full of insertions in his own handwriting.

¹ See the rubric P. 97. G. 210 — "is or shall be otherwise appointed by his Highness". This clause seems to have been an after thought, as it does not appear in the print, designated *Grafton C.* in the Parker Society edition, which seems to bear indications of being the earliest edition. See Parker Soc. ed. p. 97. cf. Preface iv, v.

not as dependents. We found at his house, what was most gratifying to us, our most dear friend doctor Peter Martyr, with his wife and his attendant Julius, master Immanuel (Tremellius) with his wife; and also Dryander and some other godly Frenchmen whom we had sent before us. All these are entertained by the archbishop of Canterbury”.

“As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into latin, we will send it to you. We hear that some concessions have been made both to a respect for antiquity and to the infirmity of the present age; such, for instance, as the vestments commonly used in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and the use of candles: so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead and the use of chrism, for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing his religion, and that rather they may be won over”.¹

¹ *Orig. Letters* pp. 535–6. From Lambeth 26 April (1549).

CHAPTER XIV.

THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW SERVICE.

The Book of Common Prayer was to come into use on Whitsunday, June 9 1549. The Act of Uniformity itself gives indications of the popular opposition it was expected to encounter by prohibiting "any interludes, plays, songs, rhymes or any other open words in derogation, depraving or displaying of the same book; or of anything contained therein". Any attempt to prevent the clergyman from using the book thus imposed, or any interruption whilst the service prescribed by it was proceeding, was to be punished by a fine of ten pounds¹ for the first offence, twenty for the second, and, for a third, forfeiture of all goods and chattels and imprisonment during life.

It was however provided as a special derogation from the uniformity of service thus ordered that „for the encouragement of learning in the tongues, in the universities of Cambridge and Oxford, the services prescribed in the book, except the Holy Communion, commonly called the mass, might be said in college chapels in Greek, Latin or Hebrew”².

¹ More than £100 of our money.

² In explaining his intention in continuing certain parts of the service in latin, Luther had expressed a pious wish, for the sake of learning, that it could be said in greek and

This provision however had no practical effect in preventing the shock experienced throughout the country by the sudden change from the latin service to the vernacular. Luther had been most careful to avoid offering any such violence to popular ideas. He was moreover perfectly alive to the effect the prohibition of the latin language would have on education, and he lays emphasis on the maintenance of a latin service for youth and for congregational use on great feasts. The provisions by which this was carried out form one of the most striking and interesting features of the early Lutheran *Kirchenordnungen*.¹

It is only too common, in forming a judgment on the use of latin in the popular services during the middle ages, to decide the question on *a priori* grounds. It is accordingly taken for granted that the substitution of a purely english service for the ancient latin one must necessarily have been a popular measure. It is however, a mistake, as experience even in the present day may show, to take for granted that the latin service is and has been no more than a closed book to the uneducated in catholic countries. Even in country parishes much of the invariable parts of the church offices and some even of the variable, have been traditionally taught to the people from childhood. To the peasant, from the time that he had sung as a chorister in his

hebrew also. The spirit shown in converting a wish, quite in place where it was originally expressed, into a provision of an Act of Parliament is characteristic of much of the ecclesiastical government of Edward's reign.

¹ For Luther's theory on the subject see Richter, I. p. 36a; also Urbanus Regius' Hanover Order 1536, *ibid.* p. 275b, and that of Wittenberg, 1533, p. 222b. The Pomeranian p. 257.

village church, the words of many of the hymns, the psalms and the order of the mass, although he had never gone through a latin school, were firmly impressed on the memory.

It may be sufficient to quote the words of an unprejudiced observer on his first visit to a catholic land. "The general impression among Protestants" he says "as to Roman Catholic worship (is) that it is without reverence, unreal, and wholly beyond the understanding of all but a few scholars. I can only say that what I saw was the contrary of all this. This I say knowing that no single testimony is sufficient to decide such a question. Some enquiry led me to believe that the majority of a french congregation followed the psalms and such parts of the service as are audibly said or sung as the act of the congregation quite as well as the english generally follow the prayer book" ¹.

And travellers who have paid attention to the matter can perfectly confirm the truth of these impressions. The latin words become not unfrequently so familiar that they suggest themselves to the uneducated even in the occurrences of ordinary daily life ². Therefore in considering the sudden substitu-

¹ T. Mozley's *Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College &c.* II p. 320.

² Daniel's remarks on this are much to the point (*Codex Liturgicus* II p. 131). "In tortuosa illa de latini sermonis dignitate atque auctoritate questione, quæ nunc quoque a multis pertractatur, restat ut diligentius in cladem inquiratur quam latina lingua ex illo tempore acceperit, quo evanescere cœpit e cultu publico. Nam sæpius observavi hanc linguam apud Romanos-Catholicos quasi adhuc vivere ita ut simpliciorum quoque hominum mentibus latinae formulae impressae sint, quas probe intelligunt. Abhinc paucis annis habitabam Monaci apud civem quendam grandævum, pium quidem sed minime cultioris ingenii;

tion of English for Latin in all the public services of the church it must be borne in mind that to a very great number this measure, so far from affording any gratification to their religious feelings, was one to which they had to be reconciled.

A few days before the new service was ordered to come into general use, Dryander writing to Bulinger from Cambridge stated that "the english churches received the book with the greatest satisfaction"¹. The event does not wholly justify the writer in his prophetic announcement. Before speaking of the armed rising in the country occasioned by its imposition, it will be convenient to consider what took place in London. Here, if anywhere, resistance to the change would be reduced to a minimum. The city obviously contained a section naturally prone to novelty of any kind. At the time there was also gathered together in it a considerable foreign element whom Bucer found to be "all godly men and most anxious for the word of God"². It was moreover subject to direct court influence and control, and whatever was done there was done in the face of authority.

At this time in St. Paul's there were two parties, represented by Bonner, the bishop, and by William May, the dean. The latter had in the previous year shown that he was ever ready to be beforehand in innovation. This year he manifested the same

tamen sæpe ex ore ejus exciderunt et elapsa sunt verba latina
e.g. "Unser Sohn ist neun Jahr in der Fremde. Das ist hart
für die Aeltern. Aber was soll man machen: Fiat voluntas tua."

¹ *Orig. Letters*. p. 350.

² *Ibid.* p. 539. "There are for instance from six to eight hundred Germans".

anxiety to enter into the intentions of the Court and the ruling powers.

Hence "Paul's choir and divers parishes in London" says Wriothsesley "began the use after the new books in the beginning of Lent" ¹, apparently on the first day a copy of the book could be obtained. On the second Sunday of Lent (March 17th 1549) after a sermon by Coverdale, the dean, "when the high mass was done, commanded the Sacrament at the high altar to be pulled down" ². And still desirous to be well in advance, on the Monday after Ascension day (June 3) the ancient choir habit was laid aside and the canons "wore hoods on their surplices after the degrees of the universities, and the petty canons tippets like other priests, and all the chantry priests were put to their pensions and to be at liberty" ³.

The Book of Common Prayer came into force on 9 June (1549). Diversity immediately showed itself. The 20th of the same month was Corpus Christi day: "and that day in divers places in London was kept holyday and many kept none, but did work openly; and in some churches service and some none, such was the division". ⁴

Notwithstanding the dismissal of the chantry priests mass continued still to be said in St. Paul's "in private chapels and other remote places of the same". The Council considered that this was "for the place, Paul's, in example not tolerable", and on 24 June they sent Bonner a peremptory order which reached the cathedral clergy on the 27th. By this it was

¹ *Chronicle*. Camd. Soc. II p. 9.

² *Grey Friars' Chron.* p. 58.

³ Wriothsesley ut sup. p. 14. He says 9 June but Grey Friars' chronicle is certainly right in giving the date 3 June.

⁴ *Grey Friars' Chron.* p. 58.

commanded "that they should have no more the apostles mass in the morning, nor our Lady mass, nor no communion at no altar in the church but at the high altar".¹ Another letter in the same terms was addressed to Thirlby, bishop of Westminster, about the continued opposition of the canons and priests of St. Peter's to the provisions of the new service book.²

Cranmer now resolved to give himself a public pattern to the people of London of the new form of service. Accordingly "on Sunday (21 July) he came suddenly to Paul's" and after denouncing those who had risen in arms against the innovations, "did the office himself in a cope and no vestment, nor mitre, nor cross, but a cross staff was borne afore him, with two priests of Paul's for deacon and subdeacon with albs and tunicles, the dean of Paul's following him in his surplice". And "so he did all the office and his satin cap on his head all the time of the office and so gave the communion himself unto eight persons of the said church".³

Hitherto the government, embarrassed by the risings, had refrained from active measures against Bonner. In all probability Cranmer's visit to St. Paul's was connected with the proceedings which were forthwith taken to bring about the compliance of the bishop of London with the new regulations.

On Tuesday, 23 July 1549 the king and Council wrote a letter to the bishop lamenting that the new book "remaineth in many places of our realm, either not known at all or not used", or that it is used

¹ *Ibid.* This extract summarizes the original order for which see Wilkins IV. 34.

² Strype *Eccl. Mem.* II. 210—11 from Thirlby's register.

³ *Grey Friars' Chron.* p. 60 and Wriothesley II. 16. The latter is again wrong as to date.

so "that the people have not that spiritual delectation in the same that to good Christians appertaineth". The fault of all this the Council declare they cannot but impute to the clergy.¹ This document also was at once communicated by Bonner to the cathedral priests.

On Sunday, 28 July, and Monday the 29th many people "were convented before the Council for hearing mass, at Cree church where the french ambassador lay". They were greatly rebuked and commanded to go there no more.² Meantime further steps were in contemplation against Bonner. On Saturday, 10 August, the archbishop of Canterbury again went to St. Paul's and "sat in the bishop's stall that he was wont to be stalled in". He preached again on the risings of the people in Devon and Cornwall, and to show "that the occasion came of popish priests was the most part of all his sermon".³ That same day Bonner was summoned before the Lords of the Council. Here by the hands of the Protector certain injunctions were handed to him which had been drawn up for his future guidance.⁴

These instructions throw much light upon the existing condition of things in London. "Heretofore" runs the document "upon all principal feasts and such as were called *majus duplex*, you yourself were wont to execute (i.e. celebrate mass) in person. Now

¹ Foxe V. p. 527.

² *Grey Friars' Chron.* p. 61.

³ Ibid. These sermons appear to have been originally composed by Peter Martyr in latin, then translated to be submitted to Cranmer who corrected and changed them for practical use. Martyr's draft is in C. C. C. MS. 340; the translation in MS. 102.

⁴ Foxe V. p. 762.

since the time that we by the advice of the whole parliament have set a most godly and devout order in our church of England and Ireland, ye have very seldom or never executed". Complaint is made "that divers of our city of London and other places within your diocese assemble themselves very seldom, and fewer times than they were heretofore accustomed, unto Common Prayer and to the Holy Communion." Further "that divers as well in London as in other parts of your diocese do frequent and haunt foreign rites and masses and contemn and forbear to praise God and pray for his majesty after such rites and ceremonies as in this realm are approved and set out by our authority".¹

Of the injunctions at the same time laid upon the bishop the first is the only one that need be here noticed. The same course that had been taken with Gardiner was now followed in regard to Bonner. He was ordered to preach at Paul's Cross and declare and set forth in his sermon certain articles to be prescribed to him by the Council.

On the feast of Assumption, hitherto observed in England as one of the chief solemnities of the year, Grey Friars' chronicle notes "that there was hanged two persons one without Aldgate and the other at Tottenham Hill, and on that day some kept holiday and some none, as St. Stephen's in Walbrook and Cole Church. Such was the division that day".²

Some days later, on the Sunday within the octave of the feast (18 August), Bonner, compelled by the Council's order "on Sunday come seven night to celebrate the communion",³ came to his cathedral

¹ Ibid. p. 779.

² p. 62.

³ Foxe V p. 745.

and "did the office at Paul's both at the procession and the communion, discreetly and sadly."¹

The net however was closing around Bonner. The 1st of September was fixed by the Council for his test sermon. On the preceding day Cranmer had arranged to give once more at St. Paul's a public exhibition of the desired ceremonial. But being unable to carry out his intention his chaplain John Joseph, afterwards one of the accusers of Bonner, occupied the pulpit and "there rehearsed, as his master did before, that the occasion (of the risings) came by popish priests".²

On the appointed day Bonner preached at Paul's cross "to a most numerous congregation and maintained with all his might the corporeal presence in the Lord's Supper"³. No sooner was the sermon over than Latimer and Hooper "assembled a great rabblement" as Bonner declared "and inveighed" against him, chiefly for the declarations he had made on the sacrament.⁴

It is unnecessary here to follow further the interesting history of Bonner's examinations and trial which led to his committal to the Marshalsea prison on 20 September and finally to his deprivation on 1 October. On the last Sunday of his freedom, 15 September, he attended a sermon at St. Paul's in which the preacher declaimed "against the Holy Sacrament, denying the verity and presence of Christ's true body and blood to be there," and then, as fol-

¹ *Grey Friars* p. 62.

² *Ibid.*

³ Micronius to Bullinger. London 30 Sept. 1549. *Orig. Letters* p. 557.

⁴ Foxe V. p. 750. Micronius also states that Hooper in that day's lecture strenuously "opposed the doctrine on the sacrament propounded by the bishop."

lowing on the slaughterings and hangings which were taking place throughout the country at the time, went on with a grim humour to declare "that faith in this part must not be coerced; but that every man may believe as he will". Bonner, feeling that his "presence and silence might unto some seem to be an allowance of heretical doctrine and a betrayal of his flock of the Catholic sort", determined to make a final public protest and rising from his place left the church.

The next morning early, before leaving for his third examination at Lambeth, he wrote "in haste to the lord mayor of London with all his worshipful brethren",¹ as not knowing when he should be able to speak with them again, "requiring and praying again and again in God's behalf, that you suffer not yourselves to be abused with such naughty preachers and teachers".²

Four days later, seeing whither events were inevitably tending, Bonner said to the archbishop: "three things I have, to wit, a small portion of goods, a poor carcass and mine own soul: the two first ye may take (though unjustly) to you: but as for my soul, ye get it not *quia anima mea in manibus meis semper*".³ That same night he was conveyed to the Marshalsea.⁴

The imprisonment of the bishop however did not

¹ In February 1550 John Butler was able to report to his friend Bullinger "that very many of the aldermen of London who were veteran papists have embraced Christ", and that "the truth is especially flourishing in London beyond all other parts of the kingdom" (*Orig. Letters* p. 636).

² Foxe V. p. 791.

³ Ibid. 784.

⁴ Ibid. and *Grey Friars' Chron.* p. 62. As to his treatment in prison see p. 65.

put a stop to the old practices to which the Council had called attention on more than one occasion. Hooper, who had been for some months Cranmer's most active instrument in London, writing to his friend Bullinger on 27 December (1549), said that although "the altars are here in many churches changed into tables, the public celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the order and institution of our Lord. Although it is administered in both kinds, yet in some places the Supper is celebrated three times a day. Where they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the *mass* of the apostles, they now have the *communion* of the apostles; where they had the *mass* of the blessed Virgin they now have the communion which they call the *communion* of the virgin; where they had the principal or high mass they now have, as they call it, the high communion. They still retain their vestments and the candles before the altars; in the churches they always chant the hours and other hymns relating to the Lord's Supper, but in our own language. And that popery may not be lost, the mass-priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the papacy".¹

If this was the state of things among "the Londoners", who, as the Venetian envoy reports, "are more inclined to obedience because they are near the court", the reception of the new service book was not likely to be very cordial in the country at large. The same authority states that even after the suppression of the risings of 1549 and the lesson of blood, "had the country people only a leader,

¹ *Orig. Letters.* p. 72.

although they have been so grievously chastised they would rise again".¹

Particular attention was devoted by the government to secure a favourable reception of the changes in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Early in May (1549) a commission was issued to the earl of Warwick with bishop Ridley and others to visit them. The object of this visitation, as understood in the universities themselves, was "to take away superstition and eradicate error".

Whilst engaged in weightier matters the visitors at Cambridge found time on Sunday 26 May, to visit again Jesus College "and commanded six altars to be pulled down in the body of the church and went from the church into a chamber where certain images were and caused them to be broken".²

After some weeks spent in an active inquisition among the colleges Ridley arranged for a great public disputation over which he would himself preside. In the first place two conclusions were affixed to the doors of the Schools: the one affirmed that transubstantiation could not be proved by Holy Scripture or the writings of the first ten centuries; the second that in the Lord's Supper there is no other oblation than a giving of thanks and a commemoration of our Lord's death. The heads of colleges were then commanded in the king's name that if they or any other had anything to say contrary to these propositions they should now bring it forward or keep silence for ever afterwards. Notice was at the same time served upon them that the feast of Corpus Christi, the third day after, was fixed for the beginning of the public disputation.³

¹ *Calendar of Venetian State papers*, v, p. 345.

² C. C. C. MS. 106 f. 490. Cooper's *Annals of Cambridge* II, p. 28.

³ See the graphic account in Alban Langdale's *Catholica Con-*

On the eve of Corpus Christi day, says the journal of the visitation, the visitors "sat likewise at Christ's College and there were before them ten or eleven of Clare Hall for the purgation of Mr. Hoskyns; they sent also for doctor Maden and also to every college for the names of those that should reply unto the said doctor Maden".

"On the Thursday, being the accustomed day of Corpus Christi all the visitors save my lord of Ely dined with Mr. Cheke in the King's College hall, where also dined my lord marquis of Northampton; and at one of the clock began the disputation in divinity upon the foresaid questions in the philosophy schools, and so continued until five; my lord marquis and all the visitors abiding from the beginning unto the end and Dr. Maden answered in his cope; Dr. Glyn, masters Langdale, Segiswick, Yonge and Parker of Trinity College replying in their silk hoods. My lord of Rochester helped Dr. Maden, and, as he saw cause to, he made answer unto every one of the repliers and 'soluted' the arguments, shewing very much learning, to the great comfort of the audience, the said lord of Rochester determining the questions *scholastico more*.

"On the Friday they sat all at Christ's college.. (and) sent for Dr. Glyn and there concluded with him that he should answer the Monday after and defend the contrary part of the former conclusions. My lord marquis dined that day with my lord of Ely.

"On the Monday, being Midsummer day, at one of the clock, Dr. Glyn defended the contrary part of

futatio, Paris, 1556, ff. 5—7. Langdale, who was one of the disputants, complains especially of the interruptions and browbeating and scoffing in which Ridley indulged. See also Ridley's *Works* ed. Parker Soc. pp. 169 seqq.

the foresaid questions and Mr. Perne, Mr. Grindal and Mr. Gest and Mr. Pilkington replying to the same.. and so continued till six of the clock”.

“On the Tuesday, 25 June, there was another disputation upon the foresaid questions which Mr. Perne defended and continued from nine of the clock until it was past twelve. Whereat all the visitors with the foresaid lords &c. were present and dined with my lord of Ely at Christ’s college. The repliers at the same disputation were first Mr. Parker, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Vavasor and Mr. Yonge. When all the repliers had done my lord of Rochester was appointed by the rest of the visitors and the noblemen to determine the truth of the said question, every man of them standing bare headed all the time of determination which was an whole hour. The senior proctor first requested openly that this might be done amongst them all. Which my foresaid lord did, by manifest scriptures and conference of the same with the authority of the most ancient doctors, both wise learnedly and godly; concluding that there was not transubstantiation to be proved nor gathered by scripture or ancient doctors in the Sacrament of the Supper of our Lord; but a commemoration of his death, and a thanksgiving as touching the second”.¹

The effect of Ridley’s measures however did not correspond to the wishes of the government. Writing on the Whitsunday of the following year (1550) from Cambridge, where he had recently been made professor of divinity, Bucer complains to Calvin that “by far the greater part of the fellows are either most bitter papists or profligate epicureans,”² who

¹ C. C. C. C. MS. 106 pp. 490 seqq.

² In his *Censura* the writer uses almost the same words “passim illis (*i. e.* parish churches) præsunt aut homines epicuræi aut papistæ” (p. 466).

as far as they are able, draw over the young men to their way of thinking". Whilst "many of the parochial clergy so recite and administer the service that the people have no more understanding of the mystery of Christ than if the latin instead of the vulgar tongue were still in use".¹

At Oxford the same course was followed as at Cambridge. Under the presidency of Holbeach, bishop of Lincoln, and his fellow commissioners "there was held a sharp disputation respecting the Eucharist" writes John ab Ulmis [from Oxford on August 7th. The writer was of opinion that the subject was made so clear that any person of ordinary capacity might easily detect the absurdity of the old doctrine.

To Bucer however, who had lately arrived in England, the event proved a most unwelcome surprise. Peter Martyr on 15 June forwarded a report of the disputation by the hands of his servant Julius to Cranmer, who was then staying at Canterbury. By the same messenger he wrote to Bucer asking his opinion about the dispute and the advisability of publishing the acts, which he had no doubt the archbishop would communicate to him. Bucer replied at considerable length on 20 June. After much that is complimentary he comes to the point. "I greatly fear" he writes "that most people who read the acts of this disputation will be entirely of the opinion that you assert that Christ is altogether absent from the Supper and that the only presence is that of his power and spirit".²

¹ *Orig. Letters.* pp. 546—7.

² *Scripta Anglicana* p. 549. How distressing the incident must have been to Bucer appears from the whole course of fruitless conciliation on the subject of the Eucharist which he had adopted. His first experience in England was to find that a rash hand

To Bucer it appeared that nothing remained to be done but to secure an opportunity for altering the acts, "and to confess", he says to Martyr, "if you can do it with a safe conscience, that Christ is certainly present in his sacraments, not absent; but you may always add that we feed on Him by faith".¹

It can be understood in the circumstances that Martyr's expositions at Oxford were not attended with much success. Recourse was had to sterner measures. "The Oxfordshire papists" ab Ulmis says "are at last reduced to order, many of them having been apprehended and some gibbeted and their heads fastened to the walls".²

Indeed the government measures to secure conformity had even less success at Oxford than at Cambridge. One of Bullinger's disciples informs him in 1550 that "Oxford abounds with those cruel beasts the Roma-

had just torn aside the veil which he had so carefully drawn over the whole subject. See Jacoby, *Liturgik der Reformatoren*, II, pp. 126—7.

¹ p. 549. The curious suggestions of Bucer as to the means by which Martyr might secure the revision of the acts should be read in the original.

² *Orig. Letters*. p. 391. The writer also says: "The countrymen are everywhere in rebellion, and have already committed some murders. The enemies of religion are rampant, neither submitting to God nor to the king. They would give a good deal to renew and confirm the act of the six articles respecting celibacy, images, divine worship and some other things which are now repealed." Bishop Latimer in his *Sermon of the Plough* preached in the January of the previous year, 1548, had warned the government of a popular rising. "The people will not bear sudden alteration" he said; "an insurrection may be made after sudden mutation, which may be to the great harm and loss of the realm" (*Sermons*. Parker Soc. p. 76).

nists".¹ And later, that the "Oxford men were still pertinaciously sticking in the mud of popery".²

It is unnecessary to enter into the details of the commotions and risings which took place within a few weeks of the imposition of the new service. As regards its reception north of the Humber later history bears sufficient witness that the abolition of the Catholic rites was never popular. In the south the whole country from the Bristol channel to the Wash was in a blaze. The religious movements were not confined to the remote parts of Cornwall and Norfolk, and they were a real cause of embarrassment and fear to the government even in the home counties. And although it was only in Devon and Cornwall that the commons formulated their demands for the restoration of the ancient rites, and elsewhere a variety of causes contributed to the disaffection, still throughout the country the changes in religion were a real factor in the alienation of the people from the ruling powers. However important in their results were the changes made by Henry VIII, the people themselves continued to worship according to the old ritual of their forefathers; and however excellent the new Prayer Book may be now considered, it in fact swept away ruthlessly the ancient and popular practices of religion and substituted others that were strange, bare and novel. No Catholic people could be under any misapprehension on that point. They had seen the Blessed Sacrament pulled away from its place over the altar and they were told by those who imposed the new service "it was not to be worshipped as it was wont to be". The old ceremonial used heretofore by the church, the palms, and ashes, the holy bread and holy water

¹ Ibid. p. 464.

² Ibid. p. 467.

were abolished and every kind of ridicule and obloquy cast upon them. Their old service of matins and mass, evensong and procession, was altered beyond recognition, whilst the chief pastor of the English church stigmatized the holy mass as "heinous and abominable idolatry", and his trusted friends and agents, the preachers, beginning with Latimer and Hooper, were still more unbridled in their denunciations of what in the minds of the nation at large was the sacred body of Christ itself.

Under these circumstances it is little to be wondered at that the men of Devon and Cornwall demanded first and before all "we will have the holy decrees of our forefathers observed, kept and performed, and the sacrament restored to its ancient honour";¹ and then that the mass should again be said in latin with the old private masses once more given back to them.

Archbishop Cranmer was a theologian and knew perfectly well the value of the changes which he had introduced into the Canon of the mass. He was at this very time meditating the production of a book the object of which is summed up in his expectation "that all faithful subjects will gladly receive and embrace the same (*i.e.* the new communion service) being sorry for their former ignorance".² The last section of this book is devoted to abuse of the sacrifice of the mass and to an enforcement "of the sacrifice of laud and praise", namely "our offering of ourselves," which had been substituted for it. But a few pages before he held up to ridicule the traditional piety of the people, who "run" he

¹ This was the main object of the Statute of the articles of Henry VIII.

² *Works on the Supper.* Parker. Soc. p. 354.

says "from altar to altar and from sacring as they call it to sacring, peeping, tooting and gazing at that thing which the priest held up in his hands. What moved the priests" he asks "to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads, or the people to cry, 'this day have I seen my maker', and 'I cannot be quiet except I see my maker once a day'? What was the case of all these, and that as well the priest as the people so devoutly did knock and kneel at every sight of the sacrament, but that they worshipped that visible thing which they saw with their eyes, and took it for very God"?¹

Foxe, who has found many imitators, closes his account of the reign of Edward VI with the assertion that no one suffered for religion during his rule. But in truth the imposition of the book of the new service was only effected through the slaughter of many thousands of Englishmen by the english government helped by their foreign mercenaries. The old dread days of the Pilgrimage of grace were renewed, the same deceitful methods were employed to win success, the same ruthless bloodshed was allowed in the punishment of the vanquished. Terror was every where struck into the minds of the people by the sight of the executions, fixed for the market days, of priests dangling from the steeples of their parish churches, and of the heads of laymen set up in the high places of the towns.

At the present day, for those who are accustomed to the Book of Common Prayer, it may be difficult to realize how deeply the english people resented the abolition of their ancient sacred rites. "When to the idea of a supreme spiritual Being as the basis of dogma" writes Montesquieu "there

¹ Ibid. p. 229.

is joined a worship attractive to the senses, this gives a great attachment to religion. For thus the highest source of motives becomes united to a natural inclination for the things of sense. A religion which imposes many observances attaches people to it more than another which has less... A pure morality is a necessary condition for such attachment; but when exterior forms of worship are magnificent this pleases us and binds us greatly to religion".¹ The worship that was now offered to the english people to replace the ancient forms, whatever may be thought of it otherwise, was certainly not calculated to win their affections.

Moreover what met the eye must have recalled to the nation a previous experience. The people had seen the pillage and devastation of the monasteries, they now witnessed the taking of inventories of such plate and ornaments as remained to their churches. They saw sacred buildings destroyed to satisfy the greed of the rich, and wrecked by the casting down of images and roods. The change of service must have brought home its meaning to every mind, and the suppression of the risings now set the hands of Cranmer and his friends free to sweep away all the externals whereby they had as yet veiled the true import of the religious revolution. An opportunity soon occurred in the diocese of Norwich. No sooner was the Act of Uniformity passed (21 Feb. 1549) than bishop Rugg resigned. The see was kept vacant for a year, in the course of which Cranmer, in virtue of his primatial authority, instituted a visitation of the diocese. The action of his visitors made it easy to comply with the Council's request in November 1550 for the substitution of a decent

¹ Montesquieu, *De l'esprit des lois*, livre xxii, chap. 2.

table in place of the altar.¹ "Knowing" says Thirlby, the new bishop, "that the most part of all altars within this my diocese be already taken down by commandment of my lord of Canterbury's grace's visitors in his late visitation, this diocese then being void".²

It was owing to measures of this kind that Peter Martyr could write in terms of congratulation to Bullinger in the early days of 1549. "Many things yet remain to be done which we have in expectation rather than reality. The perverseness of the bishops is incredible. They oppose us with all their might; yet some of that order, although very few, are favourable to the undertaking".³

"The labour of the most reverend the archbishop of Canterbury is not to be expressed, for whatever has hitherto been wrested from them, we have acquired solely by the industry and activity and importunity of this prelate; and this circumstance gives us encouragement, that some addition is always being made to what we have already obtained".⁴

But although some addition was thus being always made, what was done, was done in the face of

¹ Burnet II, 2. p. 165.

² *Norfolk Archæology* VII. p. 73.

³ These bishops were according to Hooper (Feb. 1550) Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich, Ferrar, Holbeach and Barlow of Bath. These as he (Hooper) believed, all entertained "right opinions in the matter of the Eucharist". In regard to Cranmer he adds, "the archbishop gives to all lecturers and preachers their licence to read and preach. Every one of them must previously subscribe to certain articles which if possible I will send you; one of which respecting the Eucharist is plainly the true one and that which you maintain in Switzerland" (*Orig. Letters*. pp. 76 and 71—2).

⁴ *Orig. Letters*. pp. 479—30.

opposition from every class even from those who were in some measure dependent on the government itself. On March 14, 1550, Dr. John Ponet preaching before the king and court gives a glimpse of the real state of the country. "Another talk there is" he says "whereby ye shall know such as tread God's most holy word under their feet. 'Believe' say they 'as your forefathers have done before you', and in this mind they counsel all men to stand and remain still stiffly without searching any further. By this reason, if our forefathers denied Christ we must also deny Christ. If our forefathers acknowledged the bishop of Rome to be the supreme head of the Church, we must do the like, and so forth of the popish mass and all such trumpery".¹

"And here is a question: by what means chiefly hath these talks been sown abroad and bruited amongst the people? Forsooth by the judges in their circuits and the justices of peace that be popishly affected, by bishops and their officers in their synods and other meetings of ecclesiastical persons, by schoolmasters in their grammar schools, by stewards when they keep their courts, by priests when they sit to hear auricular confession, and such like as mind nothing else but the plain subversion of the kingdom of Christ and all christian doctrine, and setting up again the doctrine and kingdom of the Romish antichrist to God's great dishonour".

"The judge in his circuit, in times past when the people hath been assembled, has persuaded the people to do as their forefathers had done before them, and to do as most men do and so they shall be most in quiet,² and to be content with such godly

¹ "*A Notable Sermon*". Printed by G. Lynne. 1550. F. 2.

² The experience of Hancock, Cranmer's preacher, will bear

doctrine as was contained in the six articles, and so forth”.

“The bishop and his officers persuade the priests of the county that they shall also follow ancient customs and usages in the church, and believe and do as the Church believeth and hath taught them, meaning by the *Church*, the church of Rome, though they say not so expressly”.

“Now here hath all the justices of peace and gentlemen and others who were at the sessions, and all the priests and others who were at the synod, learnt their lessons how they shall talk to their neighbours when they come home”.

“In so much that the schoolmaster in the grammar school hearing of it will pour this talk into the ears of his scholars. Oh! what hurt these popish schoolmasters do! They mar all, most noble prince, poisoning the children’s ears with popery in their youth”.¹

out Ponet’s statement as to the views of the judges being against the innovation. See *Narratives of the Reformation*. Camd. Soc. p. 74.

¹ Ibid. sig: G 1 and G 2. Ponet adds that if a schoolmaster finds that one of his boys is the son of a man addicted to the novelties, he does not spare the rod; but the boy gets birched “thrice against his fellows once”.

CHAPTER XV.

FURTHER PROJECTS. - THE ORDINAL.

It has already been seen that in the intention of Cranmer, who was the originator and chief promoter of the ecclesiastical changes of this reign, the Prayer Book of 1549 was a temporary measure. As early as October or November 1548 the bishops had been assured that the liturgy as submitted to them was not in its final form, although Cranmer had not informed the assembly of the precise character of the further changes meditated.

The sincere but impatient Hooper in December 1549, when Cranmer was very friendly to the advanced school of reformers, wished "nothing more for him than a firm and manly spirit". He is "too fearful" he writes "about what may happen to him. There are (in England) some six or seven bishops who comprehend the doctrine of Christ, as far as relates to the Lord's Supper, with as much clearness and piety as one could desire, and it is only the fear for their property that prevents them from reforming their churches according to the rule of God's word".¹

In this exposition of motives Hooper was doubtless too absolute. But no one can follow the steps of Cranmer as archbishop of Canterbury without clearly

¹ *Orig. Letters.* p. 72.

perceiving that whatever may have been his wishes he was ever careful to keep himself within the lines of safety. His habitual method before committing himself irrevocably to any measure was to ascertain by an essay how far he might safely go. One result of this tentative policy in matters of religious observance was to keep the whole country during Edward's short reign in perpetual unrest. Whatever was established was soon upset to make way for new provisional changes, which in turn gave place to something more novel.

As yet no change had been made in the forms for conferring ordination which were contained in the old Pontificals. But at the consecration of Ferrar to the see of St. David's in September 1548, when Cranmer was assisted by Holbeach and Ridley, some changes were made in the old ritual.¹ In the course of the following year, 1549, after Bonner's deprivation the archbishop held an ordination at St. Paul's, assisted by Ridley. "The old popish order of conferring of holy orders was yet in force" writes Strype, "but this ordination nevertheless was celebrated after that order that was soon established".²

A provision for a new Ordinal was designed by Cranmer to be made in the session of parliament which met in November 1549. On the 14th of that month the bishops made a public protest in the house that, "through the frequent proclamations that had been issued, their jurisdiction had been entirely destroyed, and that they had been brought into

¹ Strype's *Cranmer* pp. 183—4.

² *Ibid.* p. 191. See the names of those ordained in Strype. No authority is given for this statement, and Strype is not to be relied upon for accuracy of dates; but the course described is so consonant with Cranmer's usual methods that the statement may be accepted.

contempt before their own flocks". They were required by the house to draft a bill on the subject. This was produced on 18 November, declared to be unsatisfactory as claiming too much, and referred for modification to a small committee of which Cranmer was the principal.¹ A bill for a new Ordinal was introduced into the House of Peers on 8 January 1550. It seems to have given rise to considerable discussion for it only passed its first reading on the 23rd of the month and was finally voted two days later (25 January 1550). Thirteen bishops were absent from the house. Of the fourteen present, five dissented.² The act was very short, simply approving beforehand the new Ordinal, which, by six prelates and six other men of this realm learned in God's law "by the king's majesty to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them, shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the great seal of England before the 1st day of April next coming".³

No time was lost: hardly more than a week after the Act was passed, on Sunday, 2 February, the Council, after remitting to the further examination of Cranmer and Holbeach a "Scott" who was accused of having preached "against the Book of Service", proceeded to appoint "the bishops and learned men to devise orders for the creation of bishops and priests". But no names are entered in the Council register.⁴ Accordingly the names of the persons who

¹ *Journals of the Lords* pp. 359—60.

² Those in favour of the bill were Cranmer, Goodrich, Barlow, Holbeach, Ridley, Ferrar, Wharton of St. Asaph, Skyp of Hereford and Sampson of Coventry. The dissentients were: Tunstall, Heath, Day, Thirlby and Aldrich of Carlisle.

³ Statute 3 and 4 Ed. VI c. 12.

⁴ Pocock, *Troubles concerning the Prayer Book*. Camd. Soc. p. 135 seqq.

were thus to be officially connected with the book about to be issued are with one exception unknown.

From the subsequent proceedings it is certain that the book was already devised and all that was left for the "bishops and learned men" to do, was to agree to it and sign their names. For in less than a week after the Council meeting at which the appointment of the committee was mooted, on Saturday, 8 February, Heath, bishop of Worcester, was convened before the lords in Council "for that he would not assent to the book made by the rest of the bishops and clergy appointed to devise a form for the creation of the bishops and priests".¹

This statement of the Council register is formal, but it may be left to the reader to determine for himself whether in the space of six days it would be possible to draw up the new Ordinal and conduct the discussions to which so delicate a matter must inevitably give rise.²

Heath could not be moved by any representations to give his assent to the proposed book. He declared that if it were imposed he would not disobey, but further he would not go, and accordingly on Tuesday, 4 March (1550), he was committed to the Fleet prison "for that he obstinately denied to subscribe".³ Here he was confined for eighteen months. On several occasions he was brought up before the Council which strove by every means to convince him that his position was unreasonable. But neither

¹ *Council Book* (Privy Council Office) II, p. 84.

² Burnet, II 1 p. 195, considers that a digested form was already prepared, probably by Cranmer, which was submitted to the assembly. But the case as regards this is even stronger than he puts it.

³ *Council Book* ut supra p. 109.

threats nor arguments could move him, and at length, on 22 September 1551, he was brought for the last time before the Council and commanded to subscribe to the Ordinal "before Thursday next following, being the 20th, upon pain of deprivation of his bishopric". To "this command he resolutely answered that he could not find it in his conscience to do it and should well be contented to abide such end either by deprivation or otherwise as pleased the king's Majesty".¹

By the very terms of the act of parliament the "new form and manner of making and consecrating archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons" could not be delayed. It was already in print before 25 March 1550. Even as early as 5 March, Hooper preaching in London had already seen the book and expresses his wonder at its containing an oath "by saints". "How it is suffered" he says "or who is the author of that book I well know not".²

At this last date it was already known that Ridley, a "worthy minister of Christ, succeeds the bishop of London, who is deprived" and "another post is allotted to the bishop of Westminster, where he will do less mischief".³ By the transfer of Thirlby to Norwich, vacant by the resignation of Rugg, and the continued vacancy of the see of Westminster,

¹ Council Book Harl. MS. 352 f. 167. It does not appear on what ground Mr. Pocock (*Troubles concerning the Prayer Book*, Camd. Soc. p. 138 *note*) attributes the deprivation of Heath to a refusal to pull down altars. It is true that the bishop volunteered the statement that he would not consent to this if it were demanded of him; but the question never arose practically and his deprivation turned entirely on his refusal to subscribe to the ordinal as may be seen from the record in the Council Book.

² Hooper's *Early works*. Parker Soc. p. 479.

³ Hales to Gualter, London, 4 March 1550. *Orig. Letters* p. 185.

the field was left open for the operations of Ridley. What he is expected to do "if only his new dignity do not change his conduct" writes Hooper, "is to destroy the altars of Baal as he has heretofore when he was bishop of Rochester". Hooper adds that already, in March 1550, "many altars have been destroyed in this city (London) since I arrived here".¹

Ridley was appointed to his new see on 1 April 1550, and on "the 12th of April", writes the author of the Grey Friars' chronicle, "was stalled by one of the bishop of Ely's chaplains". A week later, on Sunday, 19th April, "he came into the choir at the communion time, and at that time he and the dean received and master Barne. And the two took the host of the priest in their two hands, and that same time the bishop commanded the light of the altar to be put out before *he* came into the choir."²

The new bishop of London was not long in justifying the best hopes that Hooper had expressed to Bullinger about him. "This month of June in Whitsun week," writes Wriothesley, "all the altars in every parish church throughout London were taken away and a table made in the choir for the reception of the communion."³ And "on the night of St. Barnabas' day was the altar in Paul's pulled down and a veil was hanged up beneath the steps and the table set up there. And a sennight after, there the communion was ministered".⁴

¹ *Orig. Letters*. p. 79. Hooper to Bullinger. 27 March. 1550.

² *Camd. Soc.* p. 66.

³ *Chronicle*, *Camd. Soc.* II p. 41.

⁴ *Grey Friars' Chron.* p. 67. The division of practice which had shewn itself in the preceding years was naturally aggravated. "Item" says the *Chronicle* "also this year Corpus Christi was not kept holy day, and the Assumption of our Lady. And such

The desecration and abuse to which the most Holy Sacrament, and the churches which had enshrined it, had now long been subject, had their effect not unnaturally upon the popular mind. All respect for the sacred character of the church was lost. "Item the 14th day of June", runs the chronicle, "was a man slain in Paul's church and two frays within the church that same time afterwards".¹ And again; "this year was many frays in Paul's church and nothing said unto them, and one man fell down in Paul's church and broke his neck for catching of pigeons, in the night of the 14th day of December".²

As time went on to such a pitch did these riots in holy places reach that in the year 1552 it was thought necessary to issue a royal proclamation restraining them. This document first recalled that "churches were at the beginning godly instituted for Common Prayer, preaching of the word of God and ministration of the sacraments". But, it continues, they "be now of late time in many places and specially in the city of London irreverently used. So far forth that many quarrels, riots, frays and bloodshed have been made in some of the said churches, besides shooting of handguns to doves and the common bringing in of horses and mules into and through the said churches, making the same like a stable or common inn, or rather a den or sink of all unchristianness".³

division through all London that some kept holy day and some none. Almighty God help it when His will is, for this is the second year. And also the same division was at the Nativity of our Lady" (*ibid*).

¹ *Ibid*.

² *Ibid*. p. 68.

³ (February 20th). Rot. Claus. 6. Ed. VI, Pars 8. 10* See also Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* II, p. 524.

In the pulling down of altars Ridley, although doubtless sure of his ground, had gone before the king's proceedings. It was one of those "additions always being made" which appeared so encouraging to Peter Martyr. But here again the diversity of practice in the use of altar and table, which the bishop of London had thus introduced, was an "occasion of much variance and contention" whether altars should be destroyed altogether or not. Hence again the Council, on 24 November 1551, "to avoid" as they declared "all matters of further contention and strife", ordered an uniformity on this point also, by directing that every altar should be at once taken away. With this letter, which bears Cranmer's signature together with those of other members of the Council, was forwarded to the bishops a series of reasons why "the Lord's board should be rather after the form of a table than of an altar".¹ These were put forth by Ridley to show that in pulling down altars he was not acting contrary to the Book of Common Prayer; but that "he was induced to do the same, partly moved by his office and duty wherewith he is charged in the same book, and partly for the advertisement and sincere setting forward of God's holy word and the king's Majesty's proceedings."²

As being an official declaration of the use of the

¹ A printed copy of these reasons evidently as issued by the Council is in C. C. C. C. MS. 113 ff. 39-40.

² Ridley's *Works*. Parker Soc. p. 321. There seems to be no reason for the assertion that these considerations were composed by Ridley. The Council in their letter to Ridley say: "we send unto you herewith certain considerations gathered and collected that make for the purpose, the which and such other as you shall think meet we pray you to cause to be declared to the people" (Cranmer's *Remains* p. 524).

word *altar* in the Book of Common Prayer, the second reason is interesting: "Whereas", it is said "the Book of Common Prayer maketh mention of an altar, wherefore it is not lawful to abolish that which that book alloweth: to this it is thus answered: the Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing whereupon the Lord's supper is ministered indifferently a table, an altar, or the Lord's board, without prescription of any form thereof, either of a table or of an altar, so that whether the Lord's board have the form of an altar or of a table the Book of Common Prayer calleth it both an altar and a table".¹ The order issued by the Council for

¹ Cranmer's *Remains*, p. 525. In the C. C. C. C. MS. 113, a volume containing Bucer papers, is a letter signed by him on the abolition of altars. It bears no date and gives no indication of the quality of the person addressed, who had sought his opinion. He begins by laying down that there is no Scripture *requiring* the abolition of altars. He then gives various reasons of congruence why a table is to be preferred, and he concludes that the use of a table does, and an altar does not, contribute to the faith that edifies; but he ends his letter by pointing out that, although such works as the abolition of altars may be good in themselves, they are little moment in the present juncture and that what is much more important is the preaching of things necessary for salvation, without which mere external change will be nothing but an abomination before God. "Dominus adsit autem", he writes, "ut non solum impietatis instrumenta, verum etiam et imprimis ipsæ tollantur antichristi impietates, earumque administri et defensores, impura doctrina et prophana Sacramentorum administratio, superstitio peregrinorum festorum et cæremoniarum, harumque abominationum procuratores, sacrilegi parochiarum dispoliatores et vastatores, restituta omni Christi pura doctrina et solita disciplina, et deputatis parochiis fidelibus ministris cum sufficienti provisione pro ipsis et scholis atque pauperibus. Satan enim semper quærit ut si omnino religiosi esse volumus culices excolamus et quod externum est mutemus, camelos deglutiamus

the removal of all altars, brought Day of Chichester to prison as the Ordinal had brought Heath. On the 28th of the same month (November 1550) he went to Somerset with the Council's letters and stated that "he could not conform his conscience to do what he was by the said letters commanded". He was told in reply "to do his duty, and in such things to make no conscience". The attitude of the bishop was reported to the Council on Sunday, 30 November, and he was at once summoned before it, to receive instructions as to his conduct from Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich and other lords.

He was again summoned on 4 December, further argued with, and warned of the danger of disobedience, Sunday the seventh of the month being fixed for his final reply.¹ These threats not having been effectual in moving him, on the following Thursday, 11 December, he was again brought to the Council and asked whether he would obey "touching the pulling down of altars". He replied as before "that it was against his conscience; wherefore he prayed them to do with him what they thought requisite, for he would never obey to do this thing, thinking it a less evil to suffer the body to perish than to corrupt the soul with that thing which his con-

internasque sordes dissimulemus. Laudo Deum quod vel instrumenta tolluntur impietatum, debetque res hæc populis quam diligentissime approbari; sed multo magis urgeri debent in sacris concionibus, et ubi ubi id cum fructu fieri possit, ea quæ non tantum majora sunt sed ita ad salutem necessaria ut sine illis et hæc sint Deo abominationi. Hæc sentis mecum, oras, urges; Dominus det successum." (C. C. C. C. MS. 113. ff. pp. 41—44) On 26th December of the same year 1550 he writes to the Marquis of Dorset in the same strain and with an earnestness which shows how deeply he was moved (C. C. C. C. MS. 113. f. 5a).

¹ Council Bk. Harl. MS. 352 ff. 120—123.

science would not bear".¹ He was thereupon committed to the Fleet and finally deprived along with bishop Heath in the September of the following year.

Notwithstanding the zeal and activity of Ridley the celebration of the new communion office, with the old ceremonial hitherto used in the mass, although this was expressly forbidden by him in his injunctions, was continued in St. Paul's. The matter was reported to the Council, which on 11 October 1550 ordered "that Thomas Astley should be joined with two or three more honest gentlemen in London for the observance of the usage of the communion in Paul's, whereof information was given that it was used as the very mass".² Bucer also writing at the end of 1550 says, that he hears "that there are mass priests who celebrate memories in the very time and place that the ordinary ministers are celebrating communion".³

Advantage was taken of the paucity of rubrics in the Book of 1549 to continue the ancient ceremonies in every way not expressly forbidden.⁴ Bucer in his *Censura* complains that a great many ministers so recite the communion office that people, although standing quite close, cannot understand them. And, almost echoing the injunctions of Hooper and Ridley, he declares that a great number of priests by transferring the book from the right side of the altar to the left, by reciting the Canon whilst the Sanctus was being sung, by bending down (over the altar), by

¹ Council Book in *Archæologia* XVIII p. 150.

² Council Book in Strype. *Eccles. Mem.*: II p. 372.

³ *Censura*, quoted in Dixon III 283.

⁴ For details of the ceremonies continued even after the imposition of the service see the Injunctions of Ridley (*Works*. Parker Soc. pp. 319—20) and of Hooper (*Later writings*, pp. 127—8).

lifting up their hands, genuflecting, shewing the bread and the cup of the Eucharist, striking their breasts, washing out the chalice, making the sign of the cross in the air and other gestures, as well as by vestments and lights, strive to show forth by every means they possibly can the execrable mass; whilst the superstitious people adore but do not communicate.¹ He complains moreover that the collections for the poor, which had now replaced the ancient offertory, were observed in very few parishes, and he contrasts this neglect with the care which had long been taken in this matter in Belgium, where nevertheless the true profession of the gospel meets with capital punishment.²

Although in the session of parliament (1549—50) an act had been passed for calling in, for the purpose of destruction, all the ancient service books,³ and on Christmas day 1549 a royal proclamation had been issued to the same effect, such measures in the state of public feeling, hostile to the innovations, could not possibly be effectual.⁴ Not merely was the communion celebrated like the mass in outward appearance, but the ancient mass itself continued to be said by priests

¹ *Censura*, pp. 458, 461, 465, 466, 469, 493—4.

² *Ibid.* pp. 463—4 and *De officio Regis Christiani* p. 35, 39.

³ Burnet II, 1 p. 143. All the bishops present agreed except those of Durham, Coventry, Carlisle, Worcester, Westminster and Chichester.

⁴ Hooper the zealous court preacher writing to Bullinger on 27 March 1550 says that he did not dare to go into the country. "I have not yet visited my native place (Somerset) being prevented partly by the danger of rebellion and tumult in those quarters, and partly by the command of the king that I should advance the kingdom of Christ here in London. Nor indeed am I yet able to stir even a single mile from the city without a numerous attendance." (*Orig. Letters*, p. 79.)

in secret. Bernard Gilpin, a grandnephew of bishop Tunstall, even at the close of Edward's reign, and whilst holding the king's licence as a general preacher of the reformed doctrines, still "at some times read mass; but seldom and privately".¹ If this was the practice of one who was already attached to the party of innovators, the same must certainly have been the case with the many who were zealous for the old doctrines.

The state of religion in England at the close of 1550, as it appeared to an acute observer, is recorded in the report which was drawn up in May 1551 for the Venetian government by Daniele Barbaro, who had just returned from a legation to England. The Venetian envoys were, as became the servants of that republic, men of strict orthodoxy, but they do not appear to have allowed their religious beliefs to interfere with accurate observation or dispassionate estimate of facts.

"With regard to church ceremonies" he writes, "it is true they have retained many of them; introducing many new ones, under pretence that the nature of the times requires this, as some had not at first opened their eyes to them".

"Now in 1548—9 a book was printed in english, compiled by the king's command, by many bishops and learned men and subsequently confirmed by parliament, which book is entitled "the public prayers and administrations of the sacraments and ceremonies". It was then ordered that according to the precepts of this book they were to observe the same form in the churches of England, Wales and Calais; it mentions those places because in Ireland and the islands subject to England where the english

¹ Carleton. *Life of Bernard Gilpin* (1636) p. 118.

tongue is not understood no obligation is imposed.

"In the colleges and universities, such as Oxford and Cambridge, they allow them to read the prayers in greek, latin and hebrew, to encourage students, but the service of the Lord's supper is read nowhere but in english. They officiate in the churches in the morning and evening so that all the psalms are read twelve times annually and the Testament once, except certain chapters of the Apocalypse. On holy-days they read a compendium of the litanies without commemoration of saints".

"They use bells and organs, but neither altars nor images, nor water, nor incense, nor other roman ceremonies. In all the churches, on the walls which are whitened for this purpose, below the royal arms, they inscribe certain scriptural sayings".¹

After speaking of their use of baptism, the envoy passes on to the new communion service. "On the day before the communion, or on the day itself, the communicants are bound to present themselves to the priest before the morning service, or immediately afterwards, and acquaint him with their intention, and should any of them be known to have led an infamous and scandalous life, the priest warns him not to go to the communion until after he has declared his repentance and determination to amend, making reparation for his offences and promising to

¹ This practice had already begun as early as the year 1547 and seems to have been one of the consequences of the visitation of that year. Thus the churchwardens' accounts of Wing, co. Bucks: "To Saunder and his man for whiteliming of the church 5s and 5d". (*Archæologia*. XXXVI. p. 230). Also at Bungay co. Suffolk (*East Anglian*. New Ser. I. p. 128). Scripture texts were painted at the same time. These charges become general in the churchwardens' accounts in the years 1548—9, which give a lively picture of the wreckage of ecclesiastical structures at that time.

do so. That is ordained in the book, but not observed, having been done for appearance sake. When they communicate the priests wear surplices, they dismiss the non-communicants from the choir, take as much bread and wine as may suffice, and if the wine in the chalice is not sufficient they mix it with spring water. The bread is coarser than what is used at Venice and of circular form without images, and they make a general confession which is preceded by a very long homily.

“They choose one person in each family to communicate every sunday, so certain merchants treat it as a joke and are in the habit of sending one of their servants¹; and the parish priests do this to obtain alms.”

“They allow the priests to marry, and their primate the archbishop of Canterbury has a wife; this being tolerated even in foreigners, such as Bernardino de Siena who last year had a son”.

“Even extreme unction is administered with unconsecrated oil, and if the danger is imminent they tell the sick man that if he repents heartily and affirms that Christ died for him, he has then communicated in spirit, although he do not take the Sacrament through the mouth”.

“These and other similar things were done and

¹ Hooper in his injunctions of 1551 for the diocese of Gloucester charges the parson &c. “not to permit in any wise one neighbour to receive for another, as it is commonly used in this diocese. For when he that should receive it himself by the order of the king’s law is not disposed to receive he desireth his neighbour to receive for him, which is contrary to God’s word” (*Later writings* p. 133).

Cranmer’s injunction of 29 Oct. 1550 shows that this practice existed among the members of his own cathedral church of Canterbury. “Item that every petty canon or vicar of this church do *personally* receive the communion in his own course” (*Remains*, p. 162).

ordained in the year 1548, but then in 1549—50 by royal authority another book was published and confirmed in parliament, containing the form of conferring holy orders, nor do they differ from those of the Roman Catholic religion save that in England they take an oath to renounce the doctrine and authority of the pope”.

“They read certain other ‘lessons’ from Scripture by authority of the (ecclesiastical) ministry, and use sacerdotal garments, and therefore they lately condemned bishop Hooper, who would not consent either to the sacraments or to the habits, saying that they are ceremonies of the Old Testament and a jewish and idolatrous observance”.

Barbaro then says that he has “nothing more to declare about the ceremonies of the anglican church, and is at a loss to narrate the contradictory opinions entertained in England about the faith, both with regard to the most Holy Trinity and the angels, as also about the creation of the world, the humanity of Christ, and the efficacy of the sacraments”.

“No one preaches or lectures publicly in theology, until after he has been examined by the archbishop or approved and sworn by the bishop. It hence ensues that without further law or statute, the preachers and public professors of theology propound to the people one sole doctrine according to the will of their superiors, so that the greater part of their sermons and lessons consists in abusing the Pope, (and) in preaching.. and maintaining whatever their masters choose. For these causes they lately condemned the bishop of Winchester, a very worthy man and who led the best of lives. They deprived him of his bishopric, which was perhaps his greatest sin, as it yielded him a rental of 12000 crowns, and some other bishops who will not conform to their opinions

are to be sacrificed in like manner. In addition to this, there are divers sects all over the country, where there may be said to reign the confusion of tongues, a dissolute license, a manifest scourge from God, by giving refuge to all the fugitive apostates from France, Italy and Germany. And had your ambassador to give a name to their heresies, as the followers of the chief of them consider the mass idolatrous by its consecration, and as they do not admit the real presence¹, he thinks they might be styled Sacramentarians."

"This much will suffice with regard to religion on account of which they had the audacity to enter the reporter's house, in violation of ambassadorial privileges, seizing the priest who was celebrating

¹ The "real presence" is an ambiguous phrase and was capable, as any one acquainted with the polemical writings of this period will acknowledge, of conveying, if need be, the whole range of doctrine from that of the Catholic church to that of the congregations of Zurich and Geneva.

For Calvin's teaching on the 'real presence' — "*la propre substance de son corps et son sang*" see "*De la cène*", Geneva-1540. He says "Il n'est pas seulement question que nous soyons participants de son esprit, mais il nous faut aussi participer à son humanité". For he holds that otherwise, "c'est rendre ce saint sacrement frivole et inutile". (*Euvres Françaises*, p. 186.)

Viewed in another aspect, when Gardiner urged against Cranmer that the Lutherans and even Bucer, then in England, admitted the 'real presence', Cranmer replied that although this may have been so in times past and may perhaps still (1551) be: „Yet the faith of the real presence may be called rather the faith of the papists than of the other; not only because the papists do so believe, but specially for that the papists were the first authors and inventors of that faith and have been the chief spreaders abroad of it and were the cause that others were blinded by the same error." (Cranmer's *Works on the Supper* Parker Soc. p. 21).

mass for him at home, as was written by the ambassador to the Doge in his letter, dated 24 July last" (1550)¹.

It is unnecessary here to follow in any detail the changes which took place in the year 1551. These seem all designed to prepare the way for the new Book of Common Prayer, the second of king Edward the Sixth, which was already under consideration in 1550. Preaching in the Lent of that year before the king and Council, Hooper exhorted them to go forward in the glorious work they had undertaken. "As ye have taken away the mass from the people" he said, "so take from them her feathers also, the altars, vestments and such like as apparelled her"². How this advice was followed will be briefly shown in the next chapter.

¹ Report of the most noble messer Daniele Barbaro. *Venetian State Papers* Vol. V pp. 347—53.

² *Early writings*. Parker Soc. p. 440. Latimer likewise explains wherein, in his mind, lay the virtue of the mass. "I cannot find there (i. e. in the New-Testament) neither the popish consecration, nor yet their transubstantiation, nor their oblation, nor their adoration, which be the very sinews and marrow-bones of the mass" (Ridley's *Works* p. 112). These in a later passage he declares are "by no means to be borne withal and that the only mending of it is to abolish it for ever", and, these being taken away, "the most papists of them all will not set a button by the mass." (Ibid. 122 *cf.* Latimer's *Remains* p. 257). In the light of all these passages there can be no doubt as to the import of Latimer's observation that he finds: "no great diversity in" the communion offices of the first and second Books of Common Prayer (*Remains* p. 262).

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SECOND BOOK OF 1552.

As will be now understood, changes in the Book of Common Prayer were practically decided upon before it came into actual use in the June of 1549. The particular form which the alterations took in the Communion office, the most important and vital part of the whole, was largely determined by bishop Gardiner, or rather by the almost nervous antipathy which Cranmer had for him. This dislike was natural and of long standing. The archbishop was a weak man and trusted to his suppleness for security in opposition: Gardiner, whatever may be thought of him otherwise, was a strong man able to bear alike favour and disgrace.

After nearly eighteen months of imprisonment in the Tower, a day or two after Christmas day 1549,¹ the Chancellor and Secretary Petre went to visit Gardiner. They showed him a "book passed by the parliament" as the book of public service, and told him if he would accept it Somerset would ask the king for mercy for him. He replied that he wanted justice; that he had not offended and cer-

¹ This was the Christmas day upon which the Council decided to call in all the ancient service books.

tainly had not been heard or condemned and therefore that he did not ask for mercy. As for the "book", he refused to examine it in prison.¹

After the lapse of another six months he was presented with certain articles, among which was a declaration that the "king's service book was godly and christian". This he signed; but five days later other lords of the Council came to his prison and required his subscription to a much more ample body of articles, which covered the whole ecclesiastical policy hitherto developed by the governing powers. Here it is sufficient to mention the articles which had special relation to the liturgy. He was asked to declare: that masses for the dead were rightly abolished; that the mass was mostly invented by the bishop of Rome; that private masses were the invention of man; that the Sacrament ought not to be lifted up and shewed to the people to be adored; that all mass books, couchers, grailes and other latin service books had been rightly destroyed; that the Ordinal was godly and not contrary to sound doctrine; and that the subdiaconate and minor orders were rightly abolished. This body of articles was presented to the bishop as an order of the king and he was therefore required not only to subscribe them, but to declare himself well pleased and undertake to maintain them all.²

Gardiner refused to sign; and even Ridley, who visited him next day, failed to persuade him. He asked only for a trial by justice "which, although it were more grievous, yet hath it a commodity in it, that it endeth certainly the matter".³ Twice

¹ Foxe VI. p. 72.

² Ibid. pp. 82-3.

³ Ibid. p. 74.

in the next few days the bishop was called before the Council and offered articles. He refused, and on the second occasion he begged on his knees "for the passion of God, my lords, be my good lords and let me be tried by justice whether I be faulty or no". The Council returned no answer but a further demand for his signature to the papers.

The government at length yielded to his request for a trial, and on Sunday, 14 December, (1550) they dispatched a letter to the lieutenant of the Tower directing him to take the bishop of Winchester before the archbishop and other commissioners at Lambeth on the following day and from day to day until the trial was done.¹ The only point of interest in these proceedings to the present purpose was the delivery by Gardiner to archbishop Cranmer in open court of "an explication and assertion of the true Catholic faith touching the most Blessed Sacrament of the altar." This was really a confutation of Cranmer's book on the Eucharist, published by him in the middle of the year 1550². To this challenge of Gardiner Cranmer replied immediately.

Gardiner's work was drawn up with the greatest care and moderation of tone. It was however calculated to irritate Cranmer in the highest degree. Throughout, the bishop followed the policy hitherto pursued by the Catholic party in the episcopate,

¹ Council Book Harl. MS. 352 f. 126.

² Gardiner's book was printed in 1551 without name of printer or place. It was also printed at full length by Cranmer along with his own previous book, of which this was a confutation, and a reply to Gardiner's criticisms. This last bears marks of having been written in great haste. Although highly controversial and often abusive it is of real importance for the history of this time. It appears in its most handy form in the Parker Society reprint.

whether rightly or wrongly, of contesting every inch of ground with the innovators and putting a Catholic, even if a strained, interpretation upon what had been imposed on the church by the law. For this purpose he gave the words of the Prayer Book the most Catholic meaning of which they could be made susceptible. And then, treating it as Cranmer's own work, he contrasts it with the opinions about the Eucharist which the archbishop had expressed in his book on the Sacrament, published the same year. He then left him to defend his consistency as best he might.

The primate's easiest method of meeting his adversary would have been to allow that the Book of Common Prayer as it then stood represented merely a passing phase of reform. But in fact he treated the attack in detail, contending that there was nothing in his work on the Sacrament inconsistent with the real meaning of the Prayer Book.

The passages in the controversy which relate immediately to the new service book are so important for understanding its future history that they must be here dealt with one by one. Gardiner first points out that the Fathers undoubtedly declare that "we receive in the Sacrament the body of Christ with our mouth", and then continues: "and such speech other use, as a book set forth in the archbishop of Canterbury's name called a Catechism;¹ which I allege because it shall appear it is a teaching set forth among

¹ It had been given out by some that this translation of the german Lutheran catechism was Cranmer's "man's doing" and not his own (Parker Soc. p. 188). Cranmer had admitted in his *Defence* (1550) that he had translated the work himself and he again in his reply to Gardiner on this passage repeats this admission.

us of late, as hath been also and is by the Book of Common Prayer, being the most true Catholic doctrine of the substance of the Sacrament, in that it is there so Catholically spoken of; which book the author (Cranmer) doth after specially allow, howsoever all the sum of his teaching doth improve it in that point; so much is he contrary to himself" ¹.

In reply Cranmer here passes lightly over the reference to his Lutheran catechism; but states that "the Book of Common Prayer neither uses any such speech, nor giveth any such doctrine; nor I", he says, "in no point improve that godly book nor vary from it". ² Later on Gardiner again presses him with the doctrine of his German catechism as to the reception of Christ in the Sacrament. To this the archbishop replies that the word "spiritually" should be added or understood; and "then is the doctrine of my catechism", he declares, "sound and good" ³.

The points specially dealing with the service book must be particularly noted.

(1) In treating of the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice Gardiner calls attention to the prayers for the living and dead in the ancient Canon, and then goes on to say: "whereupon this persuasion hath been duly conceived, which is also in the Book of Common Prayer, in the celebration of the Holy Supper, retained, that it is very profitable at that time when the memory of Christ's death is solemnized, to remember with prayer all estates of the church and to recommend them to God." ⁴ On this allusion to the Prayer Book Cranmer makes no remark.

¹ Parker Soc. ed. p. 55.

² Ibid. p. 56.

³ Ibid. pp. 226—7.

⁴ p. 84 *cf.* also the last words of this section.

(2) Upon that part of the Canon in the new Book which immediately precedes the words of Institution Gardiner writes: "the body of Christ is, by God's omnipotence who so worketh in His word, made present unto us, as the church prayeth it may please him so to do. Which prayer is ordered to be made in the Book of Common Prayer now set forth, wherein we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and to be to us the body and blood of Christ, which they cannot be, unless God worketh it and make them so to be"¹.

Cranmer to this replied: "Christ is present whensoever the church prayeth unto Him, and is gathered together in His name. And the bread and wine be made unto us the body and blood of Christ (as it is in the book of Common Prayer) but not by changing the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's natural body and blood, but that in the godly using of them they be unto the receivers Christ's body and blood... and therefore, in the book of the Holy Communion we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so"².

(3) Speaking of the prayer, now called the 'Prayer of humble access', which in the first book stood *after* the consecration and immediately before the Communion, Gardiner writes: "as touching the adoration of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament, which adoration is a true confession of the whole man's soul and body, if there be opportunity of the truth of God in his work, is in my judgment well set

¹ Ibid. p. 79.

² Ibid. See also p. 83, "and therefore the church &c." and p. 88. "Nor Christ doth not" &c.

forth in the Book of Common Prayer, where the priest is ordered to kneel and make a prayer in his own and the name of all that should communicate confessing therein what is prepared there”¹.

This the archbishop does not meet, but states that he has already “showed what idolatry is committed by means of the papistical doctrine concerning adoration of the Sacrament.”²

(4) Referring to the actual words of administration of the communion in the first Prayer Book, Gardiner points out that those whom Cranmer calls papists “agree in form of teaching as to the presence with what the church of England teaches at this day in the distribution of Holy Communion, in that it is there said the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine”³.

Cranmer answers: “and as concerning the form of doctrine used in this church of England in the Holy Communion, that the body and blood of Christ be under the form of bread and wine, when you shall show the place where the form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth.”⁴

(5) In the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 the following rubric is repeated from the Order of Communion attached to the mass in 1548: “and every one (*i. e.* of the consecrated breads) shall be divided in two pieces at the least, and so distributed, and men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesu Christ”.

¹ Ibid. p. 229.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. p. 51.

⁴ Ibid. p. 53.

Further, commenting on a profane passage in Cranmer's book, Gardiner remarks: "this is a marvellous rhetoric and such as the author has overseen himself in the utterance of it. But to the purpose; in the book of Common Prayer now at this time set forth in this realm, it is ordered to teach the people that in each part of the bread consecrate, broken, is the whole body of our Saviour Christ, which is agreeable to the Catholic doctrine"¹.

The archbishop meets this by saying: "and as for the book of Common Prayer, although it say that in each part of the bread broken is received the whole body of Christ, yet it saith not so of the parts unbroken, nor yet of the parts or whole reserved as the papists teach"².

Winchester sums up generally his opinion of the Book of Common Prayer in the following words: "God of his infinite mercy have pity on us and grant that the true faith of the holy mystery uniformly be conceived in our understanding and in one form of words be uttered and preached, which in the Book of Common Prayer is well termed not distant from the Catholic faith, in my judgment"³.

(6) Beyond this mention of the Prayer Book in his work against Cranmer, Gardiner, in discussing Hooper's remarks on the doctrine of the Sacrament, in the same year 1550, also appeals to it in defence of the use of altars. Condemning Hooper's attack upon

¹ Ibid. p. 62.

² Ibid. p. 64, *cf.* Also on the same subject Gardiner p. 325 and Cranmer p. 327. At p. 239 also Gardiner points out, that although the statute of the six articles had been abrogated yet the doctrine of transubstantiation "was never hitherto by any public Council or anything set forth by authority impaired". Cranmer's reply was that the doctrine was false and that was sufficient (p. 240).

³ Ibid. p. 92.

them he says: "This altar is a table before our Lord, and in the book of Common Prayer it is well called by both names. But if there be only a table as Mr. Hooper would have.. (let) there be not any ceremony in the matter, but as it were good fellowship, without either standing or kneeling.... wherein the book of Common Prayer lately set forth in this realm giveth a good lesson to avoid Mr. Hooper's fancy, which is that some ceremonies there must needs be, and then such as be old and may be well used."¹

It is now necessary to turn to what is known about the revision of the Prayer Book, in which, as will be seen, the points in the first book, which Gardiner had pleaded against Cranmer as proving the old doctrines, are specially dealt with.

Whilst the commission for the bishop of Winchester's deprivation was sitting, the archbishop was making preparations for the revision of the first english service book imposed the previous year. Peter Martyr writing from Lambeth to Bucer on 10 January 1551 says that a meeting of the bishops had been held on the matter, and he assumes that his correspondent already knew that such a meeting had been arranged. At this assembly it was settled, "as the most Reverend has informed me, that many things should be changed; but what these emendations were which they agreed upon, he neither told me nor did I dare ask him. But what Sir John Cheke (the king's tutor) told me rejoices me not a little. If the bishops will not change the things which ought to be changed, the king will do it himself, and when the matter comes to parliament he himself will interpose his royal authority"².

¹ State Papers. Dom. Vol. XII ff. 64a—65.

² See in Strype's *Cranmer* Appendix no. 61. Canon Dixon (III. 248) seems to identify this conference of the bishops with

There is no authentic or sufficient record of the

a meeting of Convocation presumed to have been held near the end of the year 1550. His authority is Heylyn, who writes: "in the Convocation which began in the former year anno 1550, the first debate among the prelates was of such doubts as had arisen about some things contained in the Common Prayer Book". After giving some details he concludes: "but what account was given appears not in the acts of that Convocation of which there is nothing left upon record but this very passage." Canon Dixon rightly says that this record has escaped the notice of Wilkins "who returns blank prorogations on the authority of Cranmer's register" (Wilkins IV. 60).

The question arises therefore whether the record cited by Heylyn is rightly placed by him in the year 1550. Cranmer's register contains the following royal writs of prorogation:

1550.

Writ dated	2 Feb.	prorogued to	21 April
—	22 April	—	11 October
—	11 October	—	21 January

1551.

Writ dated	21 Jan.	—	3 March
—	3 March	—	14 Oct.
—	14 Oct.	—	15 Nov.
—	5 Nov.	—	24 Jan. 1552 on which day

the Convocation met. The question then resolves itself into this, whether it is more likely that there is an error in this consecutive series of official documents which are entered in the episcopal register in full; or whether Heylyn made some mistake in assigning a date to the entry taken by him from the records of Convocation, which he admits were very carelessly kept during this reign, and as Fuller says, were "but one degree above blanks, scarce affording the names of the clerks assembled therein" (IV. p. 109).

As to the Convocation which met on 24 January 1552, Heylyn writes: "the acts of this Convocation were so ill kept that there remains nothing on record touching their proceedings but the names of such of the bishops as came thither to adjourn the house. Only I find a memorandum" as to the dissolution of the

persons to whom the revision was entrusted¹,

bishopric of Westminster "but this was no business of that Convocation though remembered in it". In these circumstances the only safe course is to assume the correctness of the *records* in Cranmer's register. The extract given by Heylyn doubtless relates to a meeting of the Convocation in 1552. It runs as follows: "The first debate amongst the prelates was of such doubts as had arisen about some things contained in the Book of Common Prayer; and more particularly touching such feasts as were retained and such as had been abrogated by the rules thereof; the form of words used at the giving of the bread and the different manner of administering the Holy Sacrament; which being signified unto the prolocutor and the rest of the clergy who had received somewhat in charge about it the day before, answer was made that they had not yet sufficiently considered of the points proposed; but that they would give their lordships some account thereof in the following session". The question as to feasts had been raised by Bucer in the *Censura* (p. 494) and in the *De regno Christi* (p. 48).

Bullinger, always well informed, stated to some of the Frankfort exiles that "Cranmer bishop of Canterbury had drawn up a Book of Prayer a hundred times more perfect than this that we now have" (i. e. the Book of 1552). But "the same could not take place for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and Convocation with other enemies" (*Troubles begun at Frankfort*, ed. 1846, p. 50).

¹ See Canon Dixon III. pp. 249—50. But the "Convocation" mentioned in the letters cited (p. 249, notes 1 and 2) has no relation to any meeting of Convocation of the close of 1550. The letter of ab Ulmis to Bullinger is dated 10 January 1552, (not 1551 as in Dixon). That the former is the correct date is clear from the writer's mention of the recent appointment of Goodrich bishop of Ely as Chancellor, or rather Lord Keeper. The assignment of Skinner's letter of 5 January to the year 1550 is certainly an error of the Parker Society's editor of the *Original Letters*. It must be remembered that these letters were written in latin and the word *convocatio* is evidently not used in its technical english sense, for a meeting of the body of clergy,

although there is little room for doubt as to the inspirers and chief actors in the business. All that it is necessary to note in the present case is what was actually done, and especially with the office of Holy Communion, which was not only the one all important traditional act of Christian worship, but was at this time throughout western Europe the central point round which all the controversies of the reformation turned.

On comparing the first with the second Communion office what is obvious at first sight is, that whilst the former, in spite of the substantial changes which had been made in the ancient mass, manifested a general order and disposition of parts similar to the mass itself, the latter was changed beyond recognition.

It is certain that in this the revisers, whilst accepting Bucer's suggestions as to details did not follow his ideas. He did not suggest the revolutionizing of the order of 1549. On the contrary, though keenly alive to all that in detail savoured of "superstition", he speaks of the whole office in the highest terms. "I cannot render thanks to God enough" he says "for giving a service so pure, and ordered so religiously according to the Word of God, especially considering the time when it was drawn up. A very few words and acts apart, I see nothing in it which is not altogether drawn from the Holy Scriptures";¹

called *Convocation*; but refers to a *meeting* of the commissioners upon ecclesiastical laws according to their appointment in November 1551.

Ab Ulmis, in his letter of 10 January 1552, only reports the more or less accurate gossip of his own circle as to the commission which had been issued a couple of months before. In February he is right in saying "our friend Skinner" was engaged on this commission (Cf. Dixon III 439).

¹ *Censura* p. 465. In the print the *Censura* is said to have

and in fact his recommendations involved no radical change. It is on the other hand not a little significant that everything in the first Prayer Book, upon which Gardiner had fixed as evidence that the new liturgy did not reject the old belief, was in the revision carefully swept away and altered.¹ (1) The intercession for the living and the dead in the canon of the Book of 1549 was held by Winchester to allow the mass as a propitiatory Sacrifice. This portion of the canon, with the omission of the memento of the dead altogether, was in the book of 1552 transferred to an early part of the service, and placed between the collection of the alms and the exhortations. What had survived in the first book of the ancient canon

been "written at the request of Thomas Cranmer archbishop of Canterbury". There seems however good reason for believing that this is merely an unauthorized addition of the editor and that the statement is in itself incorrect. (1) The original draft of the work (C. C. C. C. MS. 172) has no such title, and an ancient, doubtless contemporary, hand says it was addressed "to the bishop of Ely". (2) Bucer in this work is particularly careful to speak to the person to whom it is addressed in elaborated terms of respect; but he nowhere uses the word "archbishop" or "primate". He throughout speaks of him as a "bishop" and specifically as "my bishop": "*tantæ doctrinæ atque authoritatis episcopo atque episcopo meo,*" which applies to Goodrich of Ely, but hardly to Cranmer. (3) From the often quoted letter of P. Martyr to Bucer dated from Lambeth 10 Jan. 1551 it is sufficiently clear that Bucer sent a copy of the *Censura* to Matyr (not Cranmer), but that Cranmer "already knew that you (Bucer) had written (comments on the Prayer Book) to the bishop of Ely." The only comments addressed to Cranmer that are mentioned are those made by Martyr himself. In these circumstances it would appear that the statement made in the print some 25 years after Bucer's death is erroneous.

¹ The numbering here follows that of the points taken by Gardiner against Cranmer in the previous pages.

of the mass was now omitted entirely with the exception of one line.

(2) The prayer for the sanctification of the gifts on the altar by the Holy Spirit, presumed by Gardiner to be proof of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which was also objected to by Bucer, was omitted.

(3) The "prayer of humble access" which had hitherto been said kneeling before the altar after the consecration, and which Winchester had pointed to as an act of adoration, was now placed immediately before the prayer of consecration.

(4) The words of the administration of the Holy Communion in the book of 1549, which had been adduced as distinct evidence that "the old doctrine of the papists" as to the presence of Christ in the Sacrament was still that of the church of England, were replaced by others. They now ran: "take and eat this &c.", without any mention of the sacred body and blood of our Lord.

(5) The rubric stating that the whole body of Christ was to be believed as present in every portion of the consecrated host, upon which Winchester relied as further proof that the ancient doctrine was still maintained, and to which Bucer had objected, was left out in the revised book.

(6) The word "altar", adduced by Gardiner in his discussion with Hooper, was also entirely expunged from the book of 1552.

In the circumstances these changes cannot have been accidental. It seems hardly possible to doubt that in making them the revisers were actuated by a determination to leave no room in the second Book of Common Prayer for those Catholic glosses which Gardiner had endeavoured to put on certain passages in the first.

For other changes not even this excuse can be

found, so gratuitous and uncalled for do they appear. The only reason which it seems possible to give is that the innovators resolved that it should henceforth be impossible to trace in the new Communion office any resemblance however innocuous, to the ancient mass.

Taking the office as it stood in the book of 1549 the chief changes may be thus briefly stated :

(1) The *Introit* is done away with altogether.

(2) The *Kyrie* is altered, added to and imbedded in the ten commandments in such a way as to be no longer capable of being recognized.¹

(3) The *Gloria in excelsis* was moved from the beginning to the end of the office immediately before the blessing.

(4) The exhortations had hitherto stood after the creed in the usual place for the sermon. They were now in the revised book transferred to a place after the offertory sentences.

(5) The preparation for the communion with its general confession and absolution, which, though of course much longer than the ancient simple form, had kept its place in the book of 1549 immediately

¹ This change is sometimes attributed to the influence of the service drawn up by Valleranus for the use of the evangelical colony of foreigners settled at Glastonbury. But it was probably due directly to the influence of Hooper, who, during his visitation of the diocese of Gloucester in 1551, had enjoined that the priest should cause every communicant to rehearse, before receiving, the ten commandments &c. "And if it happen there be so many communicants that all cannot one after another make rehearsal of the commandments, then the curate to read out of the 20th chapter of Exodus the said commandments word for word as they be written &c.. so that the people may say them after him" (*Later writings*. Parker Soc. pp. 132—3).

before the act of communion, was in 1552 put before the Preface.

(6) The *Sanctus* following the Preface was altered in a manner which is full of significance. The ancient "Hosanna in the Highest, Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the Highest!" is purely scriptural; no objection could be taken to it therefore on this score. It has already been pointed out that the familiar repetition of the Hosanna was altered in 1549. In the book of 1552 the whole is reduced to this simple clause in which none of the original can be recognized: "Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High". There can be no doubt that the words: "Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord" were omitted on doctrinal grounds.

(7) Of the canon of 1549 little more than the bare words of Institution was now allowed to remain in the new office in its original position. As the first portion of the prayer had been utilized in an earlier part of the service, so the last portion, shortened, was now made into a separate prayer to be recited after the communion.¹

In this latter prayer moreover the words "that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ" were left out. There is no point on which Bucer writes at greater length in his *Censura*, or in which he displays more earnestness and feeling, than in his argument and entreaty that these words should be retained. It is clear that at the close of the year 1550 some persons whose opinion carried weight were in favour of this omission and of the omission of the corresponding words in

¹ The concluding four lines of this prayer are all that remained of the ancient canon.

what is called the "prayer of humble access". To this Bucer opposed himself with all the powers of his mind and heart. To him the omission was equivalent to the casting of a doubt on the reality of the act of communion.¹ "I pray our Lord" he says "to grant that these words may be kept just as they are, for they are indeed pure and most conformable to the words of the Holy Spirit addressed by our Lord himself. I have every hope therefore that this form will be kept just as it is". He expressed himself even willing to run the risk of the words being misinterpreted in the Catholic sense, rather than that they should be left out. But he thought that all chance of misunderstanding might be taken away by certain definitions, which he suggested, and he concluded his remarks with the expression of his trust that all those engaged on the work of revision would gladly retain these important words. "You are not ignorant" he says "that the eyes of all are at the present day fixed on this kingdom, to which our Lord has given such a king, such prelates, such nobles who will admit no rash or irreligious novelty. And I doubt not that my most dear colleague Peter Martyr and all those who are learned in what appertains to the kingdom of Christ will advise and desire what I do".² Notwithstanding Bucer's urgency the words were omitted in the prayer used after the words of Institution, whilst the parallel passage in the "prayer of humble access," now removed to a part of the service before the canon, was allowed to remain.

(8) The recital of the Lord's Prayer after the canon with the *Pax Domini* was done away with altogether.

¹ See as to his doctrine, p. 295 *post*, *note*.

² *Censura* pp. 473 — 476.

(9) The communion was made to follow immediately after the words of Institution.

(10) The *Agnus Dei* was omitted;¹ as was also the verse of Scripture which corresponded in the book of 1549 to the "communion" of the old missals.

(11) For these was substituted the *Gloria in excelsis* brought from the beginning of the ancient service. The office ended with a blessing.

Thus in the revised Book of 1552 nothing of the sequence of the mass was left but the collect, epistle gospel and creed. There was even an interpolation between the Preface and the new Canon.

The rubrics manifest yet further change². Thus: (1) The complicated rubric, as to the provision of the necessary bread and wine, together with a communicant by each family in turn, disappears. (2) There is no provision at all made as to the time of placing

¹ Taken in connection with the treatment to which the whole service was subjected, this omission of the *Agnus* cannot be considered accidental. According to either Catholic or Lutheran doctrine its use at the time of communion is appropriate. But the scruples felt at the strained interpretation put by Gardiner on the "prayer of humble access" as opening the door to adoration, would have a greater effect in determining the revisers to this change.

² The continued use of the alb, chasuble and cope are expressly prohibited. This was borne in mind by the royal commissioners charged with realizing the church goods in the sixth year of Edward VI. The vestment, either cope or chasuble, left by them in the church was meant not to be worn by the minister but to serve as a covering for the communion table. For historical purposes attention should be directed not to the inventories of goods found by the commissioners in the church, but to the certificate of what they left and to the reasons they not infrequently assign for leaving these objects. See for instance the Surrey church goods in vol. IV of the *Surrey Archæological collections* or the Hertfordshire church goods ed. J. E. Cussans.

the bread and wine on the table. (3) It is directed that ordinary bread be used in place of the unleavened bread. (4) The rubric which prescribes that the minister shall take "so much bread and wine as shall suffice" for the number of communicants is now omitted¹.

¹ This rubric was abolished on the recommendation of Bucer. To understand the point of his objections it is unfortunately necessary to explain his doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist as delivered at Cambridge in the year 1550. This can be done without recourse to those technical terms *real*, *substantial*, &c. to which he was himself averse and each of which requires an accurate definition before it can be used without ambiguity. Bucer, when dealing with *communion*, speaks of the presence, to use Collier's words in reference to the Helvetians, "in terms of magnificence and highest regard". In it "the true body and blood of our Lord" he says, "Christ himself, God and man, is given and received, that we may remain and live more fully in Him and He in us"¹. But as regards "the *signs*, bread and wine, they are exhibitiv tokens, and have no union whatever with the glorious body and blood of Christ, but of exhibition and testification that by them our Lord truly communicates himself to His, to be seen and fed on by faith. They have no other use than that of arousing the mind and certifying the true communication of Christ"².

This position becomes perfectly intelligible in the light of his teaching on "permanence" which is delivered with the utmost distinctness in what was probably his last lecture at Cambridge. "Transubstantiation and the idea of the permanence of the body and blood of Christ under the species of bread and wine" he places on the same level, "as the common parents of impiety and superstition", and he regards the *adoration* as the natural consequence of the doctrine of permanence³. In the light of this teaching of Bucer, there is little wonder that he took exception

¹ *Confessio de Eucharistia* p. 543 cf. p. 551.

² *Definitio plenior* pp. 552—3 cf. *Censura* p. 473.

³ *Explicatio de vi et usu S. Mysterii* p. 610—2 (lectures begun at Cambridge 9 November 1550 and interrupted by his death).

(5) Bucer had called particular attention to the manner in which the canon continued to be recited. "They are obliged by the law" he says "to say the words aloud... nevertheless they still use the former posture (of inclination) over the bread and wine so that they seem rather to wish to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord by the words, than to excite those present to communicate. I should wish therefore" he writes "that the little black crosses and the rubric about taking the bread and wine into the hands should be removed from the book, as well as the prayer for the blessing and sanctifying the bread and wine"¹. All these points were changed accordingly.

(6) The provision that on wednesdays and fridays the first part of the Communion office should be said by a priest in a cope, formerly inserted in imitation of a Lutheran practice, is done away with. (7) It is now directed that the table for the communion

to the rubric of the Prayer Book of 1549: "then shall the minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion". He regarded it as a cause of "superstition, inducing people to think that, if any bread and wine of the communion remain after it is over, there is something wrong in applying it to common use, as though there were in this bread and wine in itself something divine or holy outside of its actual use in communion" (*Censura*, pp. 552—3).

In the circumstances of this objection, there can be hardly a reasonable doubt, however repugnant it may be to modern ideas, as to the real meaning of the rubric inserted in the Book of 1552: "and if any of the bread and wine remain &c". And this especially, as Bucer, like many of the Helvetians even to the 17th century (see Frickart, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kirchen-gebräuche im ehemaligen Kanton Bern*, pp. 101—103) seems not to have objected to the continued use of unleavened bread in the communion.

¹ *Censura*, p. 472.

should stand in the body of the church and that the minister should place himself at the north side of the table. (S) Finally, a long rubric on kneeling, now commonly called the 'Black rubric' was issued as a royal proclamation¹ after some copies of the revised Book had been already published.

The fashion of placing the communion table now ordered to be generally observed had already been set by Ridley in St. Paul's in the previous year, 1551. The Tuesday in Holy week, now called the "Tuesday before Easter", the bishop directed the officials "to close up the grates besides the high altar in Paul's that the people should not look in at the time of the communion time."² And "against Easter he altered the Lord's table that stood where the high altar was and he removed the table beneath the steps into the midst of the upper choir in Paul's and set the ends east and west, the priest standing on the south side of the board"³. And on "Easterday the dean, William May, did minister himself"⁴, and "after the creed the bishop caused the veil to be drawn that no person should see but those that received"⁵.

Turning to the office of baptism the result of the revision is that practically all that had been allowed to remain of the ancient baptismal office, except the

¹ This is enrolled upon the Close Roll. 6 Ed. VI, pars. 8. For the history see Dixon III, pp. 475, 6. If Cranmer had throughout his career better observed the principles which underlie his letter on this subject it would have been happy both for the church and the country.

² *Grey Friars' chronicle*. Camd. Soc. p. 69.

³ Wriothesley II, p. 47.

⁴ *Grey Friars'*, p. 69.

⁵ Wriothesley II, p. 47.

one prayer common to both Sarum and Luther¹ was now left out, and even this prayer was subjected to mutilation². Certain insertions are made in the service which are not found in the old rite and the practice of saying part of the service at the church door is done away with at Bucer's suggestion³.

As regards the office of confirmation, the effective part of it, which in the Book of 1549 was imitated from the ancient rite, though weakened and shortened, was in the revision of 1552 improved away⁴. For it was substituted a form in which the signification of the ancient ceremony seems entirely lost⁵.

It is unnecessary to follow in further detail the changes made in the various parts of the Book of Common Prayer⁶. Their spirit is already sufficiently

¹ See p. 224 *ante* note.

² By the omission of "that by this wholesome laver of regeneration whatsoever sin is in them may be washed clean away". In regard to this prayer, see Jacoby *Liturgik der Reformatoren* I. p. 303—4.

³ The bodily omissions are Parker Soc. ed. p. 108 lines 9 to 19 and line 34 to p. 109, line 12: p. 109 line 35 to p. 110 line 7: p. 110 lines 16 to 22. The triple renunciation and triple profession, as in the ancient rite, is in 1552 changed into a single renunciation and profession. The Sarum peculiarities in the rubric before baptism retained in 1549 are omitted, as also p. 112 lines 7 to 26 and p. 113 first three lines of rubric. On exact examination it will appear that the portions of the ancient Order contained in the office of 1549 occur precisely in the passages now omitted and changed.

⁴ The omissions are Parker Soc. ed. p. 125, lines 1 to 13.

⁵ It is evidently in the same spirit that the words of the only prayer belonging to the ancient office now retained are changed from: "Send down from heaven upon them thy Holy Ghost the Comforter" into "Strengthen them with the Holy Ghost the Comforter".

⁶ In regard to the addition of the preliminary address the general

indicated and it appears in the new revision of the Ordinal no less than in the rest of the book. Even the "Holy Communion when there is a burial of the dead" is left out of the book altogether, although the collect used in it in the book of 1549 rather hints at than definitely expresses the idea of intercession for the dead¹.

Though Bucer when called upon had examined the Prayer Book with care and had expressed his opinion on every point of detail which seemed to require amendment, it may be doubted whether the work of revision as a whole commended itself to his judgment as one proper for the time. A passage occurs in his new year's gift to the king for 1551, which may be regarded as his warning to the statesmen who had the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs in the present juncture. "Your Sacred Majesty", he writes, "has already found by experience how grave are the evils

confession and absolution prefixed to the order of morning and evening prayer, it may be observed that this is the order prescribed by Bucer in his first service, drawn up for the use of Strasburg, published in December 1524 (See Luther's Works ed. Walch XX col. 526).

¹ In the opinion of Bucer, this collect contained no intercession for the dead at all. He gives this as his reason for recommending its incorporation in the burial service (*Censura* p. 490).

The order of burial in the book of 1549 retained marked traces of the ancient Catholic practice of praying for the dead. In 1552 these were entirely obliterated along with the psalms and suffrages directed to be said in the church either before or after the burial. The reason of this last omission is probably to be found in an interrogatory of Hooper in 1551. "Item: whether the curates teach that the psalms, appointed for the burial in the king's Majesty's book for thanksgiving unto God for the deliverance of the dead out of this miserable world, be appointed or placed instead of the *dirge* wherein they prayed for the dead." (*Later Writings*, Parker Soc. p. 146).

which ensued on taking away by force false worship from your people, without sufficient preliminary instruction. The instruments of impiety have been snatched from them by proclamations and the observance of the true religion has been imposed by royal command. Some have on this account made horrible sedition, others have raised perilous dissensions in the state, and to this very day wherever they can they either cause new trouble or increase what has been already excited. Some turn the prescribed form of service into a mere papistical abuse. Although it is now in the vulgar tongue, the 'sacrificers' recite it of set purpose so indistinctly that it cannot be understood, whilst the people altogether refuse to understand or to listen. Not a few of the priests show forth the sacred communion of Christ as the papistical mass and the people are present with no other intention than to assist at the mass itself. Hardly any one takes the Sacrament from the table of the Lord except the priest or the sexton, and even he does so unwillingly. The example of our Lord and of all pious princes shows that it is first of all necessary to explain to men the mysteries of the kingdom and by holy persuasion to exhort them to take up the yoke of Christ. Your sacred Majesty will perceive that to this end all your thoughts and care must be directed, and that those are not to be listened to, who will that the religion of Christ be thrust upon men only by proclamations and by laws, and who say that it is enough if the sacred services of Christ are said to the people it matters not how. It is greatly to be feared that the enemy actuates men of this mind, who strive to hand the government of the religion of Christ to men, who are both unfit for it, and who do not suffer themselves to be advised, and who thus make way for the greed

of men to seize the wealth of the church and little by little to do away altogether with Christ's religion. For those led by this spirit hope that when once the church property is confiscated there will be none found to voluntarily consecrate themselves to her ministry". Bucer concludes by suggesting that the proper course is first to obtain a sufficient supply of evangelists who by their teaching may win popular acquiescence in change and only then to proceed to legislative acts¹.

But such counsels as these were altogether disregarded by those who had the supreme control of affairs. The work of revision was pushed on with all speed. Parliament met on 23 January 1552 and

¹ *De Regno Christi* lib. II, cap. 5 pp. 60—61. This work must have been written in the autumn of 1550. The C. C. C. C. MS. 119, contains pp. 3—5 a letter to the king signed by Bucer, and pp. 45—6 a letter, entirely in Bucer's hand, to Cheke. Both are dated 21 Oct. 1550. These letters accompanied the MS. of the *de Regno Christi*, which it would seem he sent to Cheke to be by him delivered to the King. This remarkable treatise, which is full of practical knowledge and wisdom, was written in great haste: "tandem" he says to Cheke "ut potui perturbate et incondite absolvi quae de restituendo apud nos Christi regno institueram." "Studium meum et conatum S. R. M. commendabis." (p. 45). He closes his letter by these words: "no one has seen the book which I send, except the copyist and Peter Martyr, who wishes also what I do." (p. 46). How deeply Bucer felt that the crying need of the time was the reform of practical abuse rather than the framing of new prayer books and articles of belief appears from letters written later in the same year on 3 December to Cheke and on 26 December to the marquis of Dorset. He develops the same theme to the bishop of Ely at the close of his *Censura* (pp. 496—501) apologizing to the prelate for entering on this discussion of a subject upon which his opinion had not been asked.

Convocation the next day.¹ On 9 March the bill for the new Uniformity in religion was introduced into the Lords. It was read for the third time and passed on 6 April. The bishops of Carlisle and Norwich, Aldrich and Thirlby, being the only surviving members of the band who had consistently and strenuously opposed the series of liturgical innovations, voted against it. Bonner, Day, Heath and Gardiner had been deprived, and Tunstall was in prison awaiting the same sentence.

The bill was introduced into the Commons on 6 April, the day on which it was passed in the Lords. To it in its passage through the house was attached another act compelling everybody to go to church and attend the form of worship imposed. The legislature thus gave to the nation with the second Prayer Book of Edward the sixth a yet more emphatic manifestation of the belief that these compilations were unacceptable to the people at large.

The terms in which the first Prayer Book is referred to in the act imposing the second demand some notice. It is called in the statute "a very godly order set forth by the authority of parliament, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive church, very comfortable to all good people... and most profitable to the estate of this realm".² These words have not unfrequently been interpreted as the expression of a regret, whether on the part of the parliament, or Cranmer, or the bishops does not appear, that this first book had to be given up. This suggestion however hardly seems to meet the

¹ This appears in the King's writ of dissolution (16 April anno 6.) As to its Acts, see note, p. 287 *ante*.

² 5 & 6 Ed. VI, cap. 1.

circumstances of the case, for the act proceeds to state that "this (excellence) notwithstanding a great number of people in divers parts of the realm... wilfully and damnably... abstain and refuse to come to their parochial churches and other places where Common Prayer, administration of the Sacraments, and preaching of the Word of God is used upon sundays and other days ordained to be holidays". The concurrent testimony of all contemporaries shows that the popular aversion to the book of 1549 was due not to the retention but to the abolition of so many ancient Catholic rites and practices. For reformation of the popular remissness to attend the new services the act imposes a book still more radically differing from the ancient forms.

It would seem then necessary to seek some other explanation of the commendations bestowed upon the first book, especially as the bishops most likely to regret the change were now with very few exceptions removed. One more simple naturally occurs. In the reign of Edward VI no less than in that of Henry VIII all ecclesiastical matters involving the royal authority were delicately handled. The king's ecclesiastical proceedings must always be held to be 'good and godly'. The words of this act therefore are merely a decent interment of a book to which the king had once given his supreme approval.

The law passed finally on 14 April, parliament was dismissed the next day, and the book came into force on the first of November following (1552).

Although Peter Martyr writing to Bullinger from Oxford on 14 June had assured him that all things had been removed from the Book of Common Prayer which could nourish superstition¹, there is every

¹ See Goode, *An Unpublished Letter of P. Martyr* p. 15.

indication that even this second book was not intended to be final. The innovating tendencies were still at work and are manifested in the Catechism and Articles issued in the following year. A few days before the articles upon religion were sent to the bishops, "fifty-four articles concerning the uniform order to be observed in every church of this realm" were also issued by the Council¹.

But when these instructions were issued the king's days were already numbered and after a few brief months of actual use the book was set aside on the accession of queen Mary.

It is of interest to observe the criticisms passed on the book of 1552 by men of different views whose judgment was not coerced by the legal requirement that they should use it. In the troubles among the exiles at Frankfort in 1554, in which Cox, afterwards bishop of Ely, and Wittingham, afterwards dean of Durham, took so prominent a part, and which chiefly arose from the objection of some to use even this second liturgy of king Edward, the advice of Calvin and Bullinger was sought. Calvin, after declaring that his habit was "to behave himself gently and tractably in mean things, as external ceremonies", adds: "so do I not always judge it profitable to give place to their foolish stoutness who

¹ Warrant Book. Royal MS. 18 C. XXIV f. 352b. 24 May anno 7^o. Strype says 20 May and confuses the wording of this entry with that relating to the 42 articles on faith (*Eccl. Mem.* II, p. 369). He is probably correct in stating that these articles related to rites. It is curious that no trace of them has hitherto been found. It is clear from the Warrant Book that they are quite distinct from the Articles of religion, and from the Catechism which was also issued the same day, 24 May 1553.

will forsake nothing of their old wonted custom. In the liturgy of England, I see that there were many tolerably foolish things. By these words I mean that there was not that purity which was to be desired" ¹.

Bullinger enters more into detail. Wittingham went to Zurich expressly to know what he thought of the "Book of England". Bullinger he found "did like well of the english order and had it in his study, but there were certain parts of the book, as surplice, private baptism, churching of women, the ring in marriage, with such like, which he allowed not; and he neither could if he would, nor would if he might, use the same in his church, whatsoever had been reported" ².

¹ *Troubles at Frankfort about the Book of Common Prayer &c.* ed. 1846. p. 34. In a later letter to Cox Calvin opens his mind more in full on the subject of ceremonies. "Verily", he writes, "no man well instructed or of sound judgment will deny, as I think, that lights and crossings and such like trifles sprang or issued out of superstitions, whereupon I am persuaded that they who retained these ceremonies on free choice are only greedy and desirous to drink off the dregs. Neither do I see to what purpose it is to burden the church with trifling and unprofitable ceremonies, whereas there is liberty to have a simple and pure Order" (Ibid. p. 52).

In a memorandum signed by eighteen of the exiles, who perfectly knew what the use under the Book of 1552 really was, Calvin's meaning is explained. "Because that master Calvin in his letter maketh mention of lights, some might gather that he was untruly informed that in the English book lights were prescribed (the contrary whereof appeareth by the description before) where it is manifest that he useth the figure *auxesis* and that this his argument is *a majore ad minus*, for so much as lights and crossing be two of the most ancient ceremonies, having continued in the church above 1300 years, are yet for such causes abolished: how much more ought all other, that have not the like continuance, and yet abused, be utterly removed" (Ibid. p. 54).

² Ibid. p. 50.

It may be presumed that if exception were taken by Bullinger or Calvin to points of more serious import, such as the Communion office, some indication would have been given ¹.

The only examination of the book from the hand of a Catholic, not involved in english polemics, occurs in the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* of Cornelius Schulting of Cologne. He had before him only the latin translation of 1560, which was in some respects misleading ² and his judgment was troubled by two spectres, the "seditious Puritans" and the memory of Bucer. He saw however clearly that Quignon's breviary had exerted some influence on the compilation of the anglican liturgy, ³ and he sums up his judgment thus: "In almost everything it follows the customs and rites of the orthodox Lutherans except in the order of the Supper".... "From these Lutherans they received that short form of prayer and other things except the manner of celebrating the Communion" ⁴.

This opinion is of the more value, as Schulting, though unable to present what he knew in even a passable form, was profoundly versed in mediæval liturgy and had an intimate acquaintance with the whole range of new service books. Had he seen

¹ All the objections raised in 1569 were to the same effect and about ceremonies which Bullinger had heard were in use in England, but which it was explained to him were not so used in fact (see *Zurich Letters* ed. Parker Soc. II, p. 354 seqq).

² For example it contained a calendar full of saints' names, and the reservation of the Sacrament is alluded to.

³ Vol. IV, pp. 124—5. It was evidently the Preface which gave him the idea.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 137, 133. *cf.* also his *Hierarchica Anacrisis*, Pars. III, p. 87, where he says: "In the kingdom of England they observe the Supper according to the rite and order of Bucer, which is very different from that observed by the Lutherans in Saxony".

the first Prayer Book of 1549 it would have been unnecessary to make even this one reservation. But in 1552 in the revision of the Communion office the Lutheran principles of liturgical change were abandoned in favour of the radical methods prevalent in the Reformed churches.

The Book of Common Prayer thus imposed in 1552 was revived by Elizabeth in 1559. In the latter some few changes were made. For example in the Communion office (1) the forms of administration of the elements in the order of 1549 and in that of 1552 were amalgamated, and (2) what is called the "Black rubric" on kneeling was left out. The offices of baptism and confirmation, remained as they were in 1552.

The changes since made, though interesting in themselves and significant as indications of a desire which still was powerless to effect what was actually wished, are of no historical importance. In the scotch Prayer Book of 1637, a real attempt was made to return at least to the standpoint of 1549. But as regards the english Book, what it was in 1552 it practically remains to the present day. The position which was deliberately abandoned in 1549 and still further departed from in 1552 has never been recovered. The measure of the distance traversed in these new liturgies by those who controlled the english Reformation can only be duly estimated on an historical survey of the period in which the ground was lost.

APPENDIX.

- I. ACCOUNT OF MS. REG. 7 B. IV.
- II. THE FIRST SCHEME.
- III. THE SECOND SCHEME.
- IV. THE LECTIONARIES AND CALENDARS.
- V. THE DEBATE ON THE SACRAMENT IN PARLIAMENT, 1548.
- VI. THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.
- VII. NOTE ON THE ACTS OF CONVOCATION 1547.

A P P E N D I X I.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

THE Royal MS. 7 B. IV is a paper MS. in folio. It consists of 159 leaves of which the first and last are blank. The verso of the second leaf has the inscription "*Festivale et Horarum Canoniarum Series*" in what appears to be a 17th Century hand. In the following description the leaves are quoted according to the present numbering.

Contents of the Manuscript.

The MS. falls into the following divisions.

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| (1) | ff. 4—6a. | Calendar and table of lessons called below "the third". |
| (2) | ff. 7—21. | The scheme for Morning and Evening Prayer described in chapter III. It is composed of: |
| | (a) ff. 7—8. | The Preface. |
| | (b) ff. 9—10. | A rubric for the recitation of the psalter and the reading of Holy Scripture. |
| | (c) ff. 11—12a. | Rubrics on the Order of Morning and Evening Service. |
| | (d) f. 12a. | <i>Canon de abbreviandis precationibus.</i> |
| | (e) f. 12b. | Benedictions before lessons. |
| | (f) ff. 13—18a. | Hymns. |

- (g) ff. 18b—21a. Collects.
- (3) ff. 22—132. The *Festivale*; being the special lessons (lives of saints) for feast days.
- (4) ff. 133—150. The project for a breviary described in Chapter II.
- (5) ff. 151—156. Calendar of lessons from Scripture in Cranmer's handwriting, called "the *first*" below.
- (6) ff. 157—159. Calendar and table of lessons from Scripture, called "the *second*" below.

Handwritings.

Article (5) is wholly in Cranmer's hand.

Articles (1) and (6) are probably by one writer, although as the writing is purely formal it is difficult to be certain. *Article* (1) however contains insertions and corrections certainly by Cranmer.

Article (2) is all in one handwriting and seems to be the same as that of the *Festivale* (art. 3) up to fol. 48 inclusive. There are a few notes in both these *Articles* by Cranmer. At folio 50, another hand begins which finishes the *Festivale* and seems to be the same as that in which *Article* (4) is written.

Article (4) has many annotations and corrections in Cranmer's handwriting.

The MS. shows accordingly at least three hands, those of two secretaries and of Cranmer. *Articles* (1) and (6) may be by a fourth hand.

Relations of the parts of the MS. to each other.

From internal evidence it appears certain that *articles* (4) and (5) are parts of one whole.

Articles (1), (2) and (3) form another group. (6) is a Calendar intermediate between (5) and (1). In other words, (4) and (5) are the earlier scheme for a breviary,

resembling that of Cardinal Quignon. (1) (2) and (3) are an Order of Morning and Evening Prayer more nearly approaching that of the Prayer Book of 1549. And article (6) represents an intermediate stage of the Calendar.

It may be stated that the paper of Articles (4) (5) and (6) has the same watermark, see the "PA" on the wrist of the hand shown in the mark, which does not appear elsewhere in the volume.

The print here given of the MS.

Article (4) is printed in Appendix II.

Article (2) is given in Appendix III.

Articles (1) (5) and (6), the three Calendars, are dealt with together in Appendix IV.

History of the MS.

As is well known, the greater part at least of Cranmer's library on his attainder in Mary's reign passed into the possession of Henry, last earl of Arundel of the line of Fitzalan. It was placed by him in the splendid house which he subsequently fitted up at Nonsuch. "The same he has left to his posterity, garnished and replenished with rich furniture among the which his library is right worthy of remembrance". (B. Mus. MS. Reg. 17A. IX, f. 26b.)

The earl's elder and favourite daughter was already married to John, lord Lumley. Both he and his father-in-law appear as large purchasers in the sales of Cranmer's goods after his attainder. (R. O. Exch. Q. R. Miscellanea. ⁹²⁴)

Apparently therefore either by the gift of the earl of Arundel (in 1579) or by his own original purchase, the bulk of Cranmer's books and MSS. passed into lord Lumley's possession. On his death in 1609 this

library came into the hands of Henry, Prince of Wales, by which means the greater part of them are now in the Royal library or among the Royal manuscripts in the British Museum.

The MS. 7 B. IV it is true, does not any more than his 'Common Place Books' contain Cranmer's signature, But this is easily explained by the nature of the book itself, and it does bear at the bottom of folio 4a. the autograph of "Lumley", which in addition to the internal evidence of Cranmer's handwriting is sufficient proof of its history.

APPENDIX II.

CRANMER'S BREVIARY SCHEME.

THIS is a print of Article 2 of the Royal MS. 7 B. IV and comprises Cranmer's projected Breviary. The relative table of lessons is dealt with in Appendix IV.

In the following print the spelling and irregularities of the original have been retained; the erasures in the MS. are indicated in the notes, and Cranmer's annotations are printed in capitals. Only the variations from the Sarum text are given for the collects after Trinity. The orthography and mistakes in this portion of the MS. often recall those of the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* (Harl. MS. 426).

Some of the mistakes made by the scribe show that he was not accustomed to the recitation of the Divine Office ¹). As a fact Morice although so long a faithful servant of Cranmer was a layman. One at least of the blunders suggests that this part was written from dictation (the Easter Hymn "*Ad cenam agni providi*" was originally written *magni*). But from other mistakes it seems

¹) *e. g.* In *sempiternæ* in place of *supremæ* in the third strophe of the *Pange lingua*.

certain that the secretary must have written usually from a rough draft which at times he found difficult to decipher.

The sources from which Cranmer derived this new Office are indicated in the notes. There is no evidence that in this he used the York Breviary; but it is clear that he employed both Sarum and Quignon. The source of some passages has not been found, and it is possible that even some of the Sarum material may have been overlooked, as Cranmer frequently changes the traditional use of parts of the service.

It need hardly be pointed out to any one familiar with the Sarum breviary that even this early scheme was a definite departure from the ancient English order of service, and in many respects went beyond that proposed by Cardinal Quignon.

The Breviary opens, it will be understood, with the order of the office for the first Sunday of Advent, which served as a model for the rest of the year.

Ad matutinas.

*Ante omnes horas tam diurnas quam nocturnas per totum anni cursum dicatur Oratio dominica.*¹ *Qua dicta continuo incipiet*² *sacerdos Domine labia etc. Deus in adjutorium etc. Gloria patri etc. cum Haleluya. Hic mos toto anno observandus est excepto quod a Septuagesima usque ad Pascha in loco Aleluya dicitur Laus tibi domine rex eterne glorie.*³

*Invitatorium, Christum Dominum per prophetas promissum Venite adoremus.*⁴ *Psalmus Venite exultemus etc. cum Gloria patri.*^a INVITATORIUM NON REPETATUR

¹ This is derived from Quignon, "Ad matutinum. Oratio dominicalis *Pater noster*. Et praemittitur singulis horis per totum annum" (p. 19 of Dr. Legg's reprint). The Quignon Breviary is designated below as "Q"; the Sarum as "S".

² Q. interpolates here at matins confession and absolution; in Sarum immediately after *Pater, Ave*, and (perhaps) *Credo*, comes "Domine labia mea" etc. Cranmer in this follows Sarum. In the commencement of the other hours the MS. follows Q.

³ The practice of exchanging *Alleluia* for *Laus tibi* is the same in S. and Q. But the form of the rubric and its insertion here are evidently suggested by Q. (p. 19). — The "ad pascha" of the text is corrected by the inserted rubric at *Cœna Domini* (fol. 141b).

⁴ This Invitatory is not in S. Q. or York.

^a In margin.

AMPLIUS ANTE FINEM PSALMI.⁵ ET PSALMUS ALTER-
NATUM DICATUR. *Hymnus, Verbum supernum etc.*⁶
Psalmi ex ordine designati. Finiantur autem psalmi
omnes et cantica per totum annum cum Gloria patri
etc. Antiphona, Nox precessit dies autem appropinquavit;
abjiciamus ergo opera tenebrarum, et induamur arma
*lucis.*⁷ *Lectiones tres ex kalendario designato petende*
sunt.^a

HEC REGULA PONATUR ANTE LECTIONES.^b *Bene-*
dictio ad primam lectionem reddenda, Benedictione
perpetua benedicat nos pater eternus. Ad 2^{am}, Deus Dei
filius nos benedicere et adjuvare dignetur. Ad 3^{am}, Spi-
ritus Sancti gratia illuminet^c sensus et corda nostra.
Ad 4. In charitate perfecta confirmet nos Trinitas
*Sancta.*⁸ *Porro unaqueque lectio sive ad matutinas sive*
ad vespertinas horas cum Jube Domine benedicere, sa-
cerdote benedictionem subjungente, inchoabitur; atque
terminabitur cum Tu autem Domine miserere nostri

⁵ The provision for saying the Invitatory only twice comes from Q. (p. 19). The second text of Quignon makes different provisions for (1) recitation alone (2) by two or more.

⁶ This hymn is from S. not Q. From this point the scheme of matins departs from the arrangements of Sarum altogether to follow the order of Q. with probably three psalms, and with three lessons. Q. however has no antiphon, and inserts a *Pater noster* before the lessons. (S. : *Pater* and *Ave*).

⁷ This is the first antiphon of the third nocturn of Advent Sunday in S.

⁸ These four benedictions are the three of the first nocturn *per annum* on days of nine lessons, and the ninth of the Sunday office from Trinity to Advent, in S. But for the Sarum reading "corda et corpora" Cranmer substitutes that of Q. "sensus et corda" (p. 22).

a At this point is the following, afterwards crossed through by Cranmer apparently: "*Quarta lectio ex Daniele ca. 9., Septuaginta hebdomadas (so MS.) abbreviate sunt usque ad perseverabit desolacio*".

b In margin. Cranmer first began: "Benedictiones p"; this is crossed through.

c Originally: "illuminet corda"; corrected by the scribe.

(fol. 133b) *et respondebitur* Propter magnam misericordiam tuam.⁹ FINITIS LECTIONIBUS^a sequatur psalmus Miserere mei Deus etc. *Qui psalmus hoc in loco dicendus est cotidie usque ad Natalem Domini, et a Septuagesima ad Pascha. Aliis autem temporibus dicatur Te Deum laudamus etc.*¹⁰

*Ad laudes.*¹¹

Sacerdos^b incipiet Deus in adjutorium etc. *ut supra ad matutinas. Psalmi ex ordine designati et canticum Be-*

⁹ The substance of this rubric "Porro" etc. may be from either S. or Q.; but the response "Propter" &c. is from neither, nor from York.

¹⁰ As the provision, "Finitis lectionibus" &c. is derived from Q. (p. 1 and p. 19), the precise edition used by Cranmer may perhaps be identified. The first printed edition, designated by Dr. Legg as R., reads in the text, p. 1, "a dominica in septuagesima", but in the list of errata is this correction "a feria quarta cinerum". And in fact the change from *Te Deum* to *Miserere* is prescribed not at Septuagesima (p. 39) but at Ash Wednesday (p. 42). The later prints (designated P. and A. by the editor) have the correction "a feria quarta cinerum" in the text. Cranmer follows the original reading in the first edition (R.) at p. 1. But it is to be remembered that S. lays aside *Te Deum* (though it does not substitute *Miserere*) on Septuagesima.

¹¹ In lauds, Cranmer has so far departed from the order of Sarum in favour of Quignon's arrangement that it can serve no purpose to point out in detail where his scheme differs from the english rite.

In adopting Q. as his model he has made the following changes: (a) inserted a little chapter before the canticle *Benedictus*, and (b) an antiphon after it; (c) substituted "Dominus vobiscum" for the verse "Domine exaudi orationem meam" and its response before the collect; (d) omitted the commemorations; and (e) has (like Sarum) "Dominus vobiscum" instead of "Fidelium animae" &c. at the close. (See Q. pp. 22—23). This applies to the termination of all the hours. "Dominus vobiscum" nowhere occurs in Quignon's first text; this may be thought by some to confirm the view that it was originally designed for private, not public, recitation.

a Originally "Deinde".

b Originally: "Finita oratione dominica sacerdos". The first three words have been crossed through by the rubricator. This correction is in accordance with traditional practice.

neditus etc. ANTE BENEDICTUS DICATUR CAPITULUM EX SAPIENTIALIBUS LIBRIS. ET RESPONDEATUR DEO GRATIAS. ^a *Antiphona*, Gaudete in Domino semper. Modestia vestra nota sit omnibus hominibus. Dominus prope est. ¹²

Omnes collectas precedat Dominus vobiscum etc. Oremus. Excita quesumus domine potentiam tuam et veni: ut ab imminentibus peccatorum nostrorum periculis te protegente eripiamur, et te liberante salvemur. ¹³ Qui vivis etc. cum Dominus vobiscum etc. Benedicamus etc. HEE PRECES DICANTUR AD PRIMAM POST ANTIPHONAM DE TRINITATE. ^{14b} *Postremo sequantur preces cum prostratione^c hoc modo.*

¹² This is part of the third ant. of the third noct. on Sundays in Advent in S. (II. 26—47 of the Cambridge reprint which is referred to hereafter in the notes).

¹³ This is the prayer for the first Sunday of Advent in S. and Q., which however read “te mereamur protegente eripi, te liberante salvari”. It will be noticed that various expedients are resorted to in the MS. to avoid the use of the “mereamur” of the ancient prayers.

¹⁴ These preces are derived from S. not Q.

They appear to be adapted from the *preces feriales* of lauds (I. liv, or II. 89 with considerable omissions; with the addition of “Ostende” etc. from the preces at prime (II. 53) and of the antiphon of the *memoria de pace* at Vespers (I. xi) cut into two so as to form a verse and resp. The prayer is the Sarum version of the ordinary prayer after the preces at prime with the substitution of “serva” for “salva”. From the direction “*Sacerdos. Et ne nos*” it may be gathered that the Lord’s prayer was intended here to be said secretly according to the ancient mode.

These preces were incorporated in the prayer book of 1549 at the end of matins and evensong; with the insertion of the creed before the Lord’s prayer, the direction that “the minister shall say” these “with a loud voice”, and the addition of a farther surfrage at the end “O God make clean” etc. and of two collects (of the day and for peace).

^a In margin.

^b In margin. Originally (in Cranmer’s hand, “Hee preces dicantur post primam”. See note 17.

^c “Cum prostratione” crossed through by the rubricator. But see Cranmer’s own directions later at prime.

Kyrie eleison. Christe eleison. Kyrie eleison,
Pater noster *etc.*, *Sacerdos*, Et ne nos *etc.* R. Sed libera *etc.*

Sacerdos. Ostende nobis Domine misericordiam tuam.

Resp. Et salutare tuum da nobis.

Sacerdos. Domine salvum fac Regem.

Resp. Et exaudi nos in die qua invocaverimus te.

Sacerdos. Sacerdotes tui induantur justitia.

R. Et sancti tui exultent.

Sacerdos. Salvum fac populum tuum Domine.

R. Et benedic hereditati tue.

Sacerdos. Da pacem Domine in diebus (f. 134a) nostris.

R. Quia non est alius qui pugnet pro nobis nisi tu solus Deus.

Sacerdos. Dominus vobiscum *etc.*

Oremus. Domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne Deus qui nos ad principium hujus diei *etc.*¹⁵ Per Christum *etc.*

*Ad primam.*¹⁶

Post recitatam dominicam orationem incipiet sacerdos Deus in adjutorium *etc.* *ut supra ad matutinas. Hymnus, Jam lucis etc. Psalmi ex ordine designati. Atque in diebus dominicis et festivis sequetur symbolum Athanasii* Quicumque vult *etc.* *In aliis diebus* Credo in Deum patrem *etc.* *Antiphona, Te jure laudant, te glorificant*

¹⁵ The Sarum version of the prayer; but for "salva" the MS. reads "serva", and (doubtless by oversight) "moderatione" for "moderamine".

¹⁶ This order of Prime is taken from Quignon pp. 23—4, differing as widely from Sarum as in the case of lauds.

The changes made in adopting Q. are as follows: (a) after the creed an antiphon *de Trinitate* is inserted, "Te jure" *etc.* This is taken, with omission of the words "Te adorant" from S. (II, 49); (b) for a mere verse and resp. in Q. the preces are substituted, as to which see notes 14 and 18; (c) the admission of a fragment of the ancient *officium Capituli* (see note 19).

omnes creature tue, O beata Trinitas. ^{a 17} HIC DICANTUR
 PRECES CUM PROSTRATIONE. ^{b 18} *Finitis precibus* ^c
legatur loco Martilogii historia de festo si que contigerit.
 DEINDE ^d *dicet sacerdos* Pretiosa in conspectu Domini.
 R. Mors sanctorum ejus. Oremus. Sancta Maria mater
 Domini nostri Jesu Christi atque omnes sancti justi et
 electi Dei orent pro nobis PECCATORIBUS AD ^e Dominum
 Deum nostrum, ut nos ab eo (fol. 134b) et adjuvemur
 et salvemur. Qui in trinitate perfecta vivit et regnat
 Deus. Per omnia *etc.* Dominus vobiscum *etc.* Benedicamus
etc. ^{19 f}

¹⁷ The rubric erased (see note *a* below) seems to shew that the original intention of the compiler was to attach the preces to lauds; on second thoughts they were transferred to the end of prime (see note *f*); and eventually they are placed, more in accordance with precedent, before the remnant of the *officium Capituli*.

¹⁸ In the ancient rite the preces were, and still are, said by those in choir, in the penitential seasons, kneeling; at other times, standing. "Cum prostratione" is therefore quite in place here for Advent. The direction (as to which Cranmer himself seems to have been doubtful) hence found its way, but as a general direction throughout the year, into the Prayer Book of 1549, "all devoutly kneeling". This rubric was altered in 1552 into one prescribing the practice now prevailing, in which the ancient distinction of seasons is still lost.

¹⁹ "Deinde dicet" etc. This is a remnant of the ancient Sarum *officium Capituli*, which, like so much else that implies choral or common recitation of the office, finds no place in Q. The nature of this office

a "Sacerdos, Dominus vobiscum etc. Oremus Sequatur oratio de die, Excita quesumus etc. ut supra ad laudes et finiatur cum Per Christum Dominum nostrum". This has been crossed through. See note 17.

b In margin. Cranmer first wrote merely: "Hic dicantur preces" This is crossed through. But the direction is immediately renewed in the form printed above.

c Originally: "Finita prima"; the correction is in Cranmer's hand.

d Originally: "Post quam lectam"; crossed through.

e Before Cranmer's correction the text stood "nobis per Dominum".

f At the end of prime is this direction in Cranmer's hand, afterwards crossed through: "Hoc loco dicantur preces".

*Ad tertiam.*²⁰

Deus in adiutorium *etc. ut supra ad matutinas.*

Hymnus, Nunc sancte nobis Spiritis *etc. Psalmi ex ordine designati. Antiphona*, Laus et perennis gloria Deo patri et filio sancto simulque Paracleta in secula seculorum.²¹ *Sacerdos*, Dominus vobiscum *etc. et sequatur oratio de die.*

*Ad sextam.*²⁰

Hymnus, Rector potens *etc. Antiphona*, Ostende nobis Domine misericordiam tuam, et salutare tuum da nobis.²² *Cetera ut supra ad tertiam.*

*Ad nonam.*²⁰

Hymnus, Rerum Deus tenax *etc. Psalmi ex ordine designati. Antiphona*, Alter alterius onera portate et sic adimplebitis legem Christi.²³ *Cetera ut supra ad tertiam. His persolutis sequantur preces cum prostra-*

in Sarum sufficiently appears from I, dclxxxiv and dccciv, and II, 54—55. Whilst Cranmer has "Oremus" before "Sancta Maria" etc. the Sarum rubric has "Deinde dicat Sacerdos sine *Oremus*".

The "Sancta Maria" etc. shews the following variants from Sarum (a) the omission of the words "Dei", "intercedant et" and "Deum"; (b) the insertion of "Jesum Christum" (c) the change of "ut nos mereamur ab eo adjuvari et salvari" into "ut nos ab eo adjuvemur et salvemur."

²⁰ The order of Tierce and Sext (and of None up to the preces) is modelled on Quignon (p. 24). The differences are: (a) that Cranmer admits an antiphon at each hour; (b) that for the verse "Domine exaudi" etc. Cranmer has "Dominus vobiscum", etc. (see note II above).

²¹ This is the antiphon at Tierce for Sunday in S. (II, 60, but "simul" not "simulque").

²² This is the resp. and vers. for Advent after the little chapter of Sext in S., turned into an antiphon. (II, 66).

²³ This is the little chapter for ferias out of Advent in S. (II, 68), turned into an antiphon.

*tionc.*²⁴ ^a Kyrie eleison. Christe eleison, *etc. ut supra post laudes*²⁵ *preter orationem que est Adesto Domine supplicationibus nostris, et viam famulorum tuorum in salutis tue prosperitate dispone, ut inter omnes vie et vite hujus (fol. 135a) varietates tuo semper protegamur auxilio.*²⁶ Per Dominum *etc.*

*Ad vespervas.*²⁷

Dicta oratione dominica incipit sacerdos Deus in adjutorium etc. ut supra ad matutinas. Hymnus, Conductor alme siderum etc. Psalmi ex ordine designati.

*Statim post psalmos dicatur canticum Magnificat etc. cum Gloria patri etc. Antiphona, Sobrie et juste et pie vivamus in hoc seculo, expectantes beatam spem et adventum glorie Dei.*²⁸ *Deinde sequatur benedictio ante lectionem, Divinum auxilium maneat semper nobiscum.*²⁹ *Atque hec benedictio perpetuo ad vespervas dicitur. Lectio ex kalendario.*

Benedictiones ad hujus diei lectiones toto anno non

²⁴ The ferial preces of lauds (see note 14 above) were in S. said after matins, tierce, sext, none, and vespers of ferias (not sundays) in Advent (see I, lv). Cranmer has reduced their recitation to prime and none, but attached them to the sunday office also.

²⁵ The necessity for the correction, "post primam", has escaped notice.

²⁶ This prayer is the collect for the mass *pro iter agentibus*, and the third prayer of the *Itinerarium* of the present breviaries.

²⁷ The order of vespers again is taken from Q. (p. 24), with the following modifications: (a) an antiphon is added after Magnificat; (b) a lesson, that is chapter from the Bible, with its preliminary blessing, is introduced before the prayer; (c) "Dominus vobiscum" etc. is substituted for "Domine exaudi" etc. (see note 11 above).

²⁸ This is Titus II, 12. 13. "Sobrie . . . seculo" is part of the little chapter of lauds and tierce on Christmasday in S. (I. clxxxix and xciii).

²⁹ This was an occasional benediction in S. (see II, leaf B)

^a The words "Cetera . . . prostratione" crossed through by the rubricator. Cranmer adds "stet".

mutantur. Ipsas tamen lectiones cotidie mutatas ex calendario petes, preter illas que certis quibusdam diebus dicende seorsim assignantur.

Sequatur Dominus vobiscum etc. cum oratione de die.

*Ad completorium.*³⁰

Recitata oratione dominica dicat sacerdos Convertite nos Deus salutaris noster. *R.* Et averte iram tuam a nobis. *Sacerdos,* Deus in adjutorium *etc. ut supra ad matutinas. Hymnus,* Salvator mundi *etc.*³¹ *Psalmi ex ordine designati. Statim post psalmos sequatur canticum* Nunc dimittis *etc.* (fol. 135b) *Antiphona,* Salva nos Domine vigilantes, custodi nos dormientes ut vigilemus in Christo et requiescamus in pace.³² *Deinde sequantur preces cum prostratione.*³³ *Kyrie eleison etc. ut supra ad laudes. Oratio.* Illumina quesumus Domine Deus tenebras nostras, et totius noctis insidias tu a nobis repelle propitius. Per Dominem nostrum Jesum Christum filium suum, qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus per omnia secula seculorum.³⁴

³⁰ The order of compline is derived from Q. (p. 25), but with the following variations: (a) an antiphon is inserted after *Nunc dimittis*, (b) followed by the preces as prescribed at prime; preces are commonly excluded by Quignon and Cranmer here imitates Sarum (but see note 33). (c) "Fidelium animae" is omitted (see note II (e) above); (d) the antiphon of the Blessed Virgin after compline is omitted.

³¹ This hymn is not in Q. but is taken from S. in which it is the compline hymn for Christmastide and Epiphany with certain other feasts as explained II, 226.

³² This is the antiphon on *Nunc Dimittis* in S. from the octave of Epiphany to Lent, and the morrow of Trinity to Advent with certain exceptions explained I, 228 (cf. also II, ccclxvii).

³³ The preces of compline differ considerably from those of lauds and prime in S. It will be observed that Cranmer reduces them to a single unvarying form.

³⁴ This prayer is from Sarum; Q. has the "Visita" appropriate for conventual, but less so for secular, churches.

Amen. *Sacerdos*, Dominus vobiscum. *R.* Et cum spiritu tuo. Benedicamus Domino. *R.* Deo gratias.

Que oratio servatur hoc die in horis ecclesiasticis, eadem per totum anni circulum observanda est nisi peculiari regula aliter pro tempore cautum sit.

^a *Memorie detur oportere cantica Benedictus, Magnificat, et Nunc dimittis sic sequi precedentes psalmos ut nihil interseratur, sed sine interstitio cum psalmis precedentibus perpetuo ductu canantur.* ^b

DOMINICA 2^a. ^c

Dominica secunda adventus Domini. ^d

Oratio. Excita Domine corda nostra ad preparandas unigeniti tui vias : ut per ejus adventum purificatis tibi mentibus servire ^e VALEAMUS. ³⁵ Qui tecum *etc.*

(fol. 136a.) *Dominica 3^a Adventus Domini.*

^f *Oratio.* Aurem tuam quesumus Domine precibus nostris accomoda: et mentis nostre tenebras gratia tue visitationis illustra. Qui vivis *etc.*

³⁵ Here, as generally elsewhere, the collect is that proper for the day, as found in the ancient office books and Quignon. It is unnecessary therefore to do more in such cases than point out any variants of the MS. from the ancient text. Here, "servire valeamus" is substituted for the traditional "servire mereamur".

^a A line has been drawn across this passage ("Memorie . . . canantur") as if for deletion.

^b "Conantur" MS.

^c In margin.

^d "*Lectio quarta ex Esaie ca. II, Egredietur virga etc. usque ad aqua (so MS.) maris operientes*". This has been crossed through

^e Originally, "serviamus".

^f "*Lectio 4 ex Esa. 35, Confortamini, nolite timere etc. usque ad dolor et gemitus*". Crossed through.

Dominica 4a Adventus Domini.

^a *Oratio.* Excita quaesumus Domine potentiam tuam et veni, et magna nobis virtute succurre; ut per auxilium gratie tue, quod peccata nostra ³⁶ prepediunt, indulgentia tue propitiationis acceleret. Qui vivis *etc.*

In Natali Domini.

Ad primas vespertas. Hymnus, Veni redemptor omnium ³⁷ *etc. Antiphona,* Implete sunt dies Marie ut pareret filium suum primogenitum. ³⁸ *Oratio.* Concede quesumus omnipotens Deus; ut nos unigeniti tui nova per carnem nativitas liberet, quos sub peccati iugo vetusta servitus tenet. Per Dominum nostrum ³⁹ *etc.* LECTIO PONATUR ANTE LECTIONEM. ^b *Lectio ex Esaia* 40, Consolamini, consolamini popule meus *usque ad* fetus ipse portabit. ^c ⁴⁰

Ad matutinas. Invitatorium, Christum verum Deum verumque hominem natum ex Maria virgine, Venite adoremus. ⁴¹ *Hymnus,* Christe redemptor omnium ⁴² *etc.*

³⁶ S. has "peccata nostra" as here; Q., "nostra peccata".

³⁷ "Omnium" probably a mistake of the scribe for "gentium"; the compiler evidently follows S. in the choice of hymns for vespers and matins on Christmas day.

³⁸ This ant. is the 5th of the first vespers of Christmas day in S.; but "completi" has been changed to "implete"; this may be a correction by the Vulgate (Luc. II. 6).

³⁹ This prayer is not said in S. until lauds on Christmas day; in Q. (as here) it is begun at the first vespers.

⁴⁰ This is the second lesson of matins on Christmas day in S.

⁴¹ This Invitatory is not in S. Q. or York.

⁴² See note 37.

^a "*Lectio ex Esaï. ca. 52, Consurge, consurge usque ad salutare Dei nostri*"; crossed through.

^b So MS. for, "orationem". This note is in the margin.

^c "Portavit". MS.

Antiphona, Dominus dixit ad me, filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te.⁴³ *Lectio prima ex Esaie ca. 9*, Populus qui ambulabat usque ad exercituum faciet hoc. (fol. 136b). *Lectio secunda ex* ^a JOH. 1^o, In principio erat verbum etc. usque ad in sinu patris ipse enarravit. *Lectio 3^a ex Luc. 2^o*, Factum est autem usque ad sicut dictum est ad illos. *Lectio 4 ex Math. 1*, Liber generationis Jesu Christi usque ad et vocavit nomen ejus Jesum.⁴⁴

Ad laudes Antiphona, Facta est cum angelo multitudo celestis exercitus laudantium et dicentium, Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.⁴⁵ *Oratio*. Concede quesumus ut supra ad primas vesperas.

Ad vesperas. Hymnus, A solis ortus cardine⁴⁶ etc. *Antiphona*, O admirabile commercium, creator generis humani animatum corpus sumens de virgine nasci dignatus est, et procedens homo sine semine largitus est nobis suam deitatem.⁴⁷ *Lectio ex epistola ad Titum* Apparuit gratia Dei salvatoris nostri usque ad sunt enim inutiles et vane.⁴⁸

In festo Divi Stephani.

Ad matutinas. Ex Act. VI^{to} Lectio prima, In diebus illis crescente numero etc. usque ad faciem ejus tanquam

⁴³ The first ant. of the first noct. in S.

⁴⁴ The first and fourth lessons are suggested by the first lesson and gospel of matins of Christmas day in S.; the second and third, perhaps by the gospels of the three masses.

⁴⁵ The fourth ant. of lauds on Christmas day in S.; the final Alleluia omitted.

⁴⁶ So too in S.

⁴⁷ In S. this is the first of lauds on the feast of the Circumcision, and the ant. at lauds on the Vigil of the Epiphany.

⁴⁸ Perhaps suggested by the epistle of the first mass on Christmas day.

a By mistake of the scribe "Luc. 2" originally.

faciem angeli. *Lectio 2^a*. Dixit autem princeps sacerdotum *usque ad* nutritivum eum sibi in filium. *Lectio 3^a ex Act. 7^o*, Et eruditus est Moyses *usque ad* in operibus manuum suarum.

(fol. 137a). *Ad vespervas. Lectio ex eodem*. Convertat se autem Deus *usque ad* consentiens neci ejus.

In festo divi Johannis Evangeliste.

Ad matutinas. Lectio prima ex Math. 4, Ambulans Jesus juxta *etc. usque ad* secuti sunt eum. *Lectio secunda ex Joan. 13*, Amen, amen, dico vobis *usque ad* quid dixerit ei. *Lectio 3^a ex Joan. 21*, Et cum hoc dixisset *etc. usque ad* verum est testimonium ejus.

In festo d. Innocentium.

Ad matutinas. Lectio 4 ex Math. 2^o, Ecce Angelus Domini *etc. usque ad* noluit consolari quia non sunt.

Circumcisio Domini.

Ad primas vespervas. Lectio ex Gen. 17, Postquam^a ABRAHAM nonaginta et novem *etc. usque ad* pariter circumcisi sunt.

Ad matutinas. Lectio 1^a ex Deuter. 10, Et nunc Israel quid Dominus Deus tuus *etc. usque ad* sicut astra celi. *Lectio 2^a ex Galath. 5*, Fratres non sumus ancille filii *etc. usque ad* fides que per charitatem operatur. *Lectio 3^a ex Luc. 2^o*, Et postquam consummati sunt dies *etc. usque ad* priusquam in utero conciperetur.

Lectio ad Vespervas ex Colloss. 2^o, Videte ne quis vos decipiat *etc. usque ad* saturitatem carnis.

Epiphania Domini.

*Ad vespervas. Hymnus, Hostis Herodes impie*⁴⁹ *etc.*

⁴⁹ The choice of the Epiphany hymns is from S. which however had no hymn at matins and said "A Patre" etc. at lauds.

^a Originally: "Postquam vero nonaginta."

(fol. 137b). *Lectio ex Esaie* 60, Surge illuminare Hierusalem etc. usque ad laudem Domino annunciantes.⁵⁰

Ad matutinas. Hymnus, A patre unigenitus⁴⁹ etc. *Lectio 1^a Ex Math.* 2^o. Cum natus esset Jesus etc. usque ad reversi sunt in regionem suam. *Lectio secunda ex cap.* 3^o. *Math.* In diebus illis venit Johannes baptizans etc. usque ad in quo mihi bene complacui. *Lectio tertia ex Joan.* 2^o, Et die tertia nuptie facte etc. usque ad crediderunt in eum discipuli ejus.

Ad vesperras. Lectio ex Esaie 49, Et nunc hec dicit Dominus formans me etc. usque ad pauperum suorum miserebitur. HEC ORATIO PONATUR AD PRIMAS VESPERAS.^a *Oratio.* Deus, qui hodierna die Unigenitum tuum gentibus stella duce revelasti: concede propitius, ut qui jam te ex fide cognovimus, usque ad contemplandam speciem tue celsitudinis perducamur.⁵¹ Per Christum Dominum etc.

Dominica prima post octavas,⁵² Epiphaniæ.

Invitatorium, Dominum qui fecit nos Venite adoremus.⁵³ *Hymnus*, Eterne rerum conditor⁵⁴ etc. *Antiphona ad matutinas*, Servite Domino in timore et exultate ei cum tremore.⁵⁵

Antiphona ad laudes. Spiritus omnis laudet Dominum,

⁵⁰ The third lesson of matins of Epiphany in S.

⁵¹ In S. this is the prayer at lauds and *second* vespers. In Q. one prayer only as here".

⁵² "Post octavas." This arrangement (as well as that of the following Sundays) follows S. It is to be presumed the office of the feast was to be repeated on the Sunday within the octave.

⁵³ The Invitatory for Fridays in S.

⁵⁴ The Sunday hymn at lauds in S.

⁵⁵ The first ant. of the first noct. of the Sunday office from the octave of Epiphany to Passion Sunday in S.

^a In margin.

quia ipse dixit et facta (fol. 138a) sunt omnia, mandavit et creata sunt universa.⁵⁶ *Oratio.* Vota quesumus Domine supplicantis populi celesti pietate proseguere: ut et que agenda sunt videant, et ad implenda que viderint convalescant. Per Christum Dominum *etc.*

Ad vespervas. Hymnus, Deus creator⁵⁷ *etc. Antiphona,* Sciamus omnes quia Dominus ipse est Deus, cui jubilemus et exulemus et laudemus nomen ejus in eternum.⁵⁸ *Invitatorium, hymni, et antiphonæ hujus diei ad diem cinerum durabunt.*

Dominica 2^a.

Oratio. Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui celestia simul et terrena moderaris: supplicationes populi tui clementer exaudi, et pacem tuam nostris concede temporibus. Per Christum *etc.*

Dominica 3^a.

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, infirmitatem nostram propitius respice; atque ad protegendum nos dexteram tue majestatis extende. Per Christum *etc.*

Dominica 4^a.

Deus, qui nos in tantis periculis constitutos, pro humana scis fragilitate non posse subsistere; da nobis salutem mentis et corporis; ut ea que pro peccatis nostris patimur te adjuvante vincamus. Per Christum *etc.*

(fol. 138b.)

Dominica 5^a.

Familiam tuam quesumus Domine continua pietate custodi ut que in sola spe gratie celestis nititur, tua semper protectione muniatur. Per Christum *etc.*

⁵⁶ The few occasions on which these antiphons were said (the 2nd and 5th of lauds) see in S (II, 29).

⁵⁷ In S. the sunday hymn of vespers until Lent was "Lucis creator" (I, ccccxviii); "Deus Creator" was said at vespers of the saturday before the first sunday after the octave of Epiphany.

Dominica in Septuagesima.

^a *Hinc ad Pascha usque, loco Aleluya et Te Deum dicetur Laus tibi Domine etc. et psalmus Miserere.*⁵⁸

Oratio. Preces populi tui quesumus Domine clementer exaudi; ut qui juste pro peccatis nostris affligimur, pro tui nominis gloria misericorditer liberemur. Per Christum *etc.*

Dominica 60^a.

Oratio. Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, dirige actus nostros in beneplacito tuo; ut in nomine dilecti filii tui valeamus bonis operibus abundare. Per Christum *etc.*⁵⁹

Dominica quinquages.

Oratio. Preces nostras quesumus Domine clementer exaudi; atque a peccatorum nostrorum vinculis absolutos ab omni nos adversitate custodi. Per Christum *etc.*

In die cinerum.

Invitatorium, Hodie si vocem ejus audieritis nolite obdurare corda vestra.⁶⁰ *Hymnus,* Audi benigne⁶¹ *etc.* *Antiphona* (fol. 139a). Convertimini ad me in toto corde vestro in jejuniis et fletu et planctu.⁶² *Lectio* 1^a *ex Esaie* 58, Clama ne cesses *etc. usque ad* erunt sicut meridies. *Lectio* 2^a *ex Johe* 3^o, Factum est verbum

⁵⁸ See notes (3) and (10).

⁵⁹ In S. this is the prayer "sexta die a nativitate domini" (I, cclxiv); but "valeamus" has been substituted for "mereamur". The clause "doctoris gentium protectione" in the Sarum prayer for Sexagesima, originating in the Roman station being at St. Paul's, doubtless induced the compiler to omit it.

⁶⁰ In S. the Invitatory on Passion Sunday; at York, on the fourth Sunday in Lent (*Brev.*, Surtees Soc., I. 329).

⁶¹ "Audi benigne" in S. begins on the first Sunday of Lent (at lauds).

⁶² Part of the little chapter of lauds, or ant. of *memoria pro penitentibus*, on Ash Wednesday in S.

Domini *etc. usque ad* et non fecit. *Lectio* 3^a *ex Joel* 2^o, Magnus enim dies Domini *etc. usque ad* ut dominantur eis nationes.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, Derelinquat impius viam suam et vir iniquus cogitationes suas et revertatur ad Dominum, et miserebitur ejus.⁶³ *Oratio*. Exaudi quesumus Domine supplicum preces, et confitentium tibi parce peccatis; ut pariter nobis indulgentiam tribuas benignus et pacem.⁶⁴ Per Christum *etc.*

Ad vesperas. Hymnus, Ex more docti mistico⁶⁵ *etc. Antiphona*, Lavamini, mundi estote, auferte malum cogitationum vestrarum ab oculis meis.⁶⁶

Ad completorium. Loco Salvator mundi *dicatur hymnus* Christe qui lux *etc.*⁶⁷

*Invitatorium, hymni et antiphone prescripta usque ad dominicam in passione durabunt.*⁶⁸

Dominica prima quadragesime.

Oratio. Inchoata jejunia quesumus Domine benigno favore proseguere; ut observantiam quam corporaliter exhibemus, mentibus etiam synceris exercere valeamus.⁶⁹ Per Christum *etc.*

⁶³ Part of the little chapter of sext on the first monday in Lent, and thenceforward on ferias for a fortnight.

⁶⁴ The prayer of the *memoria pro pœnitentibus* in S. (I, dlvi).

⁶⁵ In S. this hymn begins at first vespers of the first sunday in Lent.

⁶⁶ In S., part of the little chapter of tierce on monday after the first sunday in Lent. and thenceforward on ferias to Passion Sunday.

⁶⁷ This hymn in S. is begun at compline on the first sunday of Lent.

⁶⁸ As is well known, though the season of Lent is now popularly regarded as beginning, with the fast, on Ash Wednesday, it was in early times regarded as beginning with the first sunday; of this earlier practice there is a survival in the Breviary which does not change to the Lenten order until the first vespers of the sunday. By the present rubric the provisions of the traditional office books in this matter are abolished.

⁶⁹ The prayer for friday after Ash Wednesday in S.

(fol. 139b.)

Dominica secunda.

Oratio. Deus, qui conspicias omni nos virtute destitui: interius exteriusque custodi; ut et ab omnibus adversitatibus muniamur in corpore, et a pravis cogitationibus mundemur in mente. Per *etc.*

Dominica 3^a.

Oratio. Deus, innocentie restitutor et amator, dirige ad te tuorum corda servorum; ut spiritus tui fervore concepto, et in fide inveniantur stabiles, et in opere efficaces.⁷⁰ Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

Dominica 4^a.

Oratio. Concede quesumus omnipotens Deus; ut qui ex merito nostre actionis affligimur, tue gratie consolatione respiremus. Per Christum *etc.*

Dominica in passione.

AD VESPERAS. HYMNUS, VEXILLA REGIS PRODEUNT.
AD COMPLETORIUM UT AD 2^{as} VESPERAS.

AD MATUTINAS. *Invitatorium*, Christum Dei filium quia sua nos passione redemit, Venite adoremus.⁷¹

Hymnus, 1. Pange lingua. 2. De parentis. 3. Hoc opus nostre salutis. 4. Quando venit *etc.* 5. Vagit infans *etc.* 6. Gloria et honor *etc.*⁷²

⁷⁰ The prayer of vespers on wednesday after the second sunday of Lent in S.

⁷¹ This *Invitatory*, not in the traditional books, is taken from Q.

⁷² The hymn, partly at matins and partly at lauds, on Passion Sunday in S. which however omits the verse "Vagit infans". It is probable that the source actually used was Clichtoveus's *Elucidatorium* fol. 30 b; for in Cranmer's copy of this book at the end of the verse "Vagit infans" is a red ink mark; such marks are readily to be recognised by persons who have used the printed books formerly belonging to the archbishop. It should be added, that the hymn in the form given in the text is in Quignon, p. 53-4. But see also note 75, and the Introductory note to Appendix III.

Antiphona, Popule meus quid feci tibi, aut quid molestus fui. Responde mihi.⁷³ *Lectio prima ex Math.* 26, Et factum est cum *etc. usque ad* hec fecit in memoriam ejus. *Lectio 2^a ex eodem*, Tunc abiit unus (fol. 140a), *etc. usque ad* exierunt in montem Oliveti. *Lectio 3^a ex eodem*, Tunc dixit illus Jesus, omnes vos *etc. usque ad* Ecce, appropinquavit qui me tradet.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, Circumdederunt me canes
. consilium malignantium obsedit me.⁷⁴

Ad vesperas. Hymnus, I. Vexilla regis prodeunt.
2. Confixa clavis. 3. Quo vulneratus. 4. Impleta sunt.
5. Te summa Deus.⁷⁵ HIC HYMNUS DICATUR AD
PRIMAS VESPERAS ^a. *Antiphona*, Foderunt manus meas
et pedes meos et dinumeraverunt omnia ossa mea.⁷⁴
Lectio ex eodem ca. quo supra, Adhuc eo loquente
ecce *etc. usque ad* ut videret finem.

HEC ORATIO PONATUR AD PRIMAS VESPERAS. ^a
Oratio. Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui humano generi,
ad imitandum humilitatis exemplum, salvatorem nostrum
carnem sumere et crucem subire fecisti: concede propitius;
ut et patientie ipsius documenta, et resurrectionis consortia HABERE ^b valeamus. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

⁷³ The fourth ant. of lauds in S.

⁷⁴ The use of this verse (occurring in the first psalm of prime on sundays) for the antiphon was perhaps suggested by the ninth resp. of matins on Passion Sunday in S.

⁷⁵ Of this hymn the fifth, sixth and seventh verses, "Arbor decora", "Beata cujus", and "O crux ave", given in S. and Q., are omitted (Q. omits "Confixa clavis"). In Cranmer's copy of the *Elucidatorium*, fol. 30a, there is a mark (slight, it is true) after the fourth verse ("Te summa" in the doxology).

^a In margin.

^b The scribe had placed "habere" after "ipsius"; and this is the reading of both Q. and S., in which this prayer is that of Palm Sunday.

HOC COMPLETORIUM DICATUR AD PRIMAS VESPERAS.^a
*Ad completorium. Hymnus, Cultor Dei memento etc. Antiphona, Media vita in morte sumus. Quem querimus adiutorem nisi te Domine, qui pro peccatis nostris juste irasceris; Sancte Deus, Sancte fortis, Sancte et misericors, Salvator parce peccatis nostris.*⁷⁶

Hujus dici invitatorium, hymni, antiphone, usque ad Cenam Domini cotidie dicentur.

Feria secunda.

Ad matutinas, Lectio I. ex Math. 26, Princeps autem sacerdotum etc. usque ad flevit amare. Lectio 2^a, ex Math. 27, (fol. 140b.) Mane autem facto usque ad constituit mihi Dominus. Lectio 3^a ex eodem ca. Jesus autem stetit usque ad tradidit eis ut crucifigeretur.

Ad vespervas. Lectio ex eodem ca. Tunc milites etc. usque ad Hic est Jesus rex Judeorum.

Feria tertia.

Lectio prima ex eodem cap. Tunc crucifixi sunt usque ad et apparuerunt multis. Lectio 2^a ex eodem ca. Centurio autem usque ad signantes lapidem cum custodibus. Lectio 3^a ex Marci 14, Erat autem pascha etc. usque ad et paraverunt pascha.

Feria 4.

Lectio prima ex eodem, Vespere autem facto usque ad exierunt in montem Olivarum. Lectio 2^a ^b ex eodem

⁷⁶ In S. this is the ant. on *Nunc dimittis* from the third sunday of Lent to Passion Sunday (York from the 4th sunday to Cena Domini). But both read at the end, "Salvator amarae morti ne tradas nos".

^a In margin.

^b "3^a" MS.

ca. Et ait eis Jesus, omnes scandalizabimini *etc. usque ad* Ecce qui me tradet prope est. *Lectio tertia ex eodem*, Et adhuc eo loquente *usque ad* conveniens testimonium illorum.

Ad vesp̄eras. Lectio ex eodem, Et surgens summus sacerdos *usque ad* et cepit flere.

Feria Quinta.

Ad matutinas. Lectio I ex Marc. 15, Et confestim mane *usque ad* flagellis cesum ut crucifigeretur. *Lectio 2^a ex eodem*, Milites autem duxerunt *etc. usque ad* convitiabantur ei. *Lectio 3^a ex eodem*, Et facta hora sexta *usque ad* aspiciebant ubi poneretur.

Lectio ad vesp̄eras,^a Appropinquabat autem *usque ad* et paraverunt pascha.

(fol. 141a.)

Feria 6.

Ad matutinas. Lectio I, Et cum facta esset hora *usque ad* qui hoc facturus esset. *Lectio 2^a*, Facta est autem contentio *usque ad* dixit eis satis est. *Lectio 3^a*, Et egressus ibat secundum *etc. usque ad* et potestas tenebrarum.

Lectio ad vesp̄eras. Comprehendentes autem eum *etc. usque ad* audivimus de ore ejus.

Sabbatho.

Ad matutinas. Lectio prima ex Joan. 11, Erat autem quidam languens Lazarus *etc. usque ad* et moriamur cum eo. *Lectio 2^a*, Venit itaque Jesus *usque ad* ut hic non moreretur. *Lectio tertia*, Jesus ergo rursus *usque ad* ut apprehendant eum.

Lectio ad vesp̄eras, Jesus ergo ante sex dies *usque ad* post eum abiit.

^a The scribe has omitted here "ex Lucae 22".

AB HIIS VESPERIS AD PASCHA DICATUR ORATIO,
RESPICE QUESUMUS DOMINE, ETC.⁷⁷

Dominica palmarum.

Lectio prima ad matutinas ex Joan. ca. 12, Erant autem quidam gentiles *etc. usque ad* et abscondit se ab eis. *Lectio secunda ex eodem*, Cum autem tanta signa *etc. usque ad* Pater sic loquor. *Lectio 3^a ex Math. cap. 21*, Et cum appropinquasset *usque ad* ibique mansit.

Lectio ad vespervas ex Joan. ca. XIII^o. Ante diem festum pasche *usque ad* accipit eum qui me misit.

Feria 2^a.

Ad matutinas. Lectio prima ex Joan. ca. 13, Cum hec (fol. 141b.) dixisset *usque ad* donec ter me neges. *Lectio 2^a ex Joann. ca. 14*, Et ait discipulus suis *etc. usque ad* et in vobis erit. *Lectio tertia ex eodem*, Non relinquam vos orphanos *usque ad* Surgite, eamus hinc.

Lectio ad vespervas ex Joan. ca. 15, Ego sum vitis vera *usque ad* quia ab initio mecum estis.

Feria 3.

Ad matutinas. Lectio I ex Joann. ca. 16, Hec locutus sum vobis *usque ad* quia vado ad patrem. *Lectio 2^a ex eodem*, Dixerunt ergo ex discipulis *usque ad* ego vici mundam. *Lectio 3^a ex Joann. 17*, Hec locutus est Jesus *usque ad* et ego in ipsis.

Lectio ad vespervas ex Joan. ca. 18, Hec cum dixisset Jesus *usque ad* et calefaciens se.

Feria iiii.

Lectio prima ex eodem, Pontifex ergo interrogavit *usque ad* erat autem Barrabas latro. *Lectio 2^a ex Jo. ca. 19*, Tunc ergo apprehendit Pilatus *usque ad* illum

⁷⁷ This prayer in S. begins at vespers on wednesday; in Q. at lauds of Holy Thursday.

ut crucifigeretur. *Lectio 3^a ex eodem*, Susceperunt autem Jesum *usque ad* tradidit spiritum.

Lectio ad vesperas ex eodem, Judei ergo quoniam *etc. usque ad* posuerunt Jesum.

HOC TRIDUO NON DICITUR DOMINE LABIA, DEUS IN ADJUTORIUM, GLORIA PATRI, NEC HYMNUS, NEC VENITE, NEC INVITATORIUM.^{78 a}

In Cena Domini.

Ad matutinas, psalmi tres, viz. 68, Salvum me fac Deus; (fol. 142a) *et 69*, Deus in adjutorium; *et 70*, In te Domine speravi. *Omittantur autem psalmi feriales hoc die, et duobus sequentibus. Ad matutinas vero antiphona*, Zelus domus tue comedit me et opprobria exprobrantium tibi ceciderunt (super)^b me.⁷⁹ *Lectio 1^r de Lamentationibus Hieremie*, Quomodo sedet sola civitas *etc. usque ad* et cor meum merens. *Lectio 2^a ex Exod. 12*, Dixit quoque Dominus ad Moisen et Aaron *etc. usque ad* ritu perpetuo. *Lectio 3^a ex Hebr.^c 11*, Convenientibus ergo vobis *etc. usque ad* cum hoc mundo damnemur.

Omittatur hoc TRIDUO^d Miserere, quoniam ad laudes postea dicitur.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, Traditor autem dedit illis signum dicens, Quemcumque osculatus fuero ipse est, tenete eum.⁸⁰ Kyrie Eleison.

⁷⁸ The practice is the same in both S. and Q.; but the wording of the rubric is from S.

⁷⁹ The psalms and ant. are from the first nocturn in S.

⁸⁰ So too S.

^a In margin.

^b Omitted in MS.

^c So MS. for "1 Cor".

^d The scribe had written "loco".

R. Domine miserere. Christus factus est obediens usque (ad) mortem.

Sacerdos. Christe eleison.

R. Qui expansis in cruce manibus traxisti omnia ad te secula.

Sacerdos. Christe eleison.

R. Qui prophetice prompsisti, Ero mors tua, O mors.

Sacerdos. Kyrie eleison.

R. Christus Dominus factus est obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.

Deinde sequatur (fol. 142b), *psalmus* Miserere *cum oratione* Respice quesumus Domine super hanc familiam tuam, pro qua Dominus noster Jesus Christus non dubitavit manibus tradi nocentium, et crucis subire tormentum. Qui tecum *etc.*⁸¹

Ad vespervas. Antiphona, Cenantibus autem eis accepit Jesus panem, benedixit, ac fregit deditque discipulis suis.⁸⁰ *Lectio ex Joann.* 12, Ante diem festum *etc. usque ad* accipit eum qui me misit. *Oratio.* Respice quesumus *etc. ut supra.*

Ad completorium. Antiphona, Christus factus est pro nobis obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.⁸⁰ *Oratio.* Respice *etc.*

In die Parasceves.

Ad matutinas psalmi tres : 2, Quare fremuerunt; 21, Deus Deus meus respice; 26, Dominus illuminatio. *Antiphona,* Diviserunt sibi vestimenta mea et super vestem meam miserunt sortem.⁷⁹ *Lectio* 1^a EX GEN. 22, Tentavit Deus Abraham *usque ad* obedisti voci mee. *Lectio* 2^a, *ex Esai.* Liii, Quis credidit auditui *usque ad* pro transgressoribus rogavit. *Lectio* 3^a *ex epistola ad Hebr. ca.* 9,

⁸¹ The text, with omissions, from S. (II, declxxxii—iii); but by reducing the whole to the method of mere preces the dramatic force of this part of the office is lost.

Habuit quidem et prius *usque ad* eterne hereditatis.

AD LAUDES. *Antiphona*, Proprio filio suo non pepercit Deus, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum.⁸²
Preces cum oratione ut pridie.

(fol. 143a.) *Ad vespervas. Antiphona*, Dederunt in escam meam fel et in siti mea potaverunt me aceto.⁸³ *Lectio ex epistola ad Hebr. cap. 9*, Ubi enim testamentum est *etc. usque ad* expectantibus se ad^a salutem.

Completerium ut pridie.

In vigilia pasche.

Ad matutinas. Psalmi 15, Conserva me Domine; 75, Notus in Judea Deus; 87, Domine Deus salutis.⁸⁴ *Antiphona*, Posuerunt me in lacu inferiori in tenebrosis et in umbra mortis.⁸⁵ *Lectio prima ex Osee* 13, De manu mortis liberabo eos *etc. usque ad* vinum libavi. *Lectio 2^a ex Joan.* 19, Rogavit Pilatum Joseph ab Arimathea *etc. usque ad* signantes lapidem cum custodibus. *Lectio 3^a ex I Petri* 4, Christo igitur passo in carne *etc. usque ad* commendent animas suas in benefactis.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, O mors, ero mors tua. Morsus tuus ero inferne.⁸⁶ *Reliqua omnia ut in die Cene.*

Ad vespervas. Deus in adjutorium *etc. cum* Aleluya.⁸⁷

Antiphona, vespere autem sabbathi que illuscescit in prima sabbathi, venit Maria Magdalene et altera

⁸² The first ant. of lauds in S.

⁸³ This does not appear in the Breviaries as an ant. or resp.

⁸⁴ The third psalm of the first nocturn, and the second and third of the third, in S.

⁸⁵ The verse of the eighth resp. of matins of Holy Saturday in S.

⁸⁶ The first ant. of lauds of the day in S.

⁸⁷ These vespers of Holy Saturday of course depart from the ancient order; nor do they accord with Q.

^a Corrected from "in".

Maria videre sepulchrum, ALLELUYA.⁸⁸ HINC AD FESTUM USQUE TRINITATIS ANTIPHONE OMNES FINIENTUR CUM ALLELUYA. *Lectio ex Math.* 28, Vespere autem (fol. 143b) sabbathi que lucescit *etc. usque ad* diebus usque ad consummacionem seculi. *Oratio.* Deus, qui pro nobis filium tuum crucis patibulum subire voluisti, ut inimici a nobis expelleres potestatem: concede nobis famulis tuis ut in resurrectionis ejus gaudiis semper vivamus. Per eundem *etc.*⁸⁹

Ad completorium. Salva nos Domine vigilantes, custodi nos dormientes; ut vigilemus in Christo et requiescamus in pace.⁹⁰

In die Pasche.

Invitatorium, Alleluya, Christus hodie surrexit. Venite adoremus eum, Alleluya.⁹¹ *Hymnus,* Aurora lucis rutilat⁹² *etc.* *Antiphona,* Angelus autem Domini descendit de celo et accedens revolvit lapidem et sedit super eum, Alleluya.⁹³ *Lectio 1^a Exod.* 12 et 13, Egressus est omnis exercitus *etc. usque ad* nec in cunctis finibus tuis. *Lectio 2^a ex Jona* ca 2^o. Et preparavit Dominus piscem *usque ad* Jonam in aridam^a. *Lectio tertia ex Math.* ca. 28, Vespere autem sabbathi *usque ad* diebus usque ad consummacionem seculi. Te Deum *etc.*

Ad laudes. Antiphona, Et valde mane una sabbath-

⁸⁸ The ant. of the resp. in S.

⁸⁹ This is the prayer at the office of the Sepulchre before the matins of Easter day in S.

⁹⁰ In S. the ant. is "*Alleluya quater*".

⁹¹ Altered from S.

⁹² This arrangement is adopted from Q. Sarum has no hymn at matins during Easter week.

⁹³ The first ant. of lauds in S.

^a "Joanam in aridam" MS.

orum veniunt ad monumentum orto jam sole, Alleluya⁹⁴. *Oratio*. Deus, qui hodierna die (fol. 144a) per Unigenitum tuum eternitatis nobis aditum devicta morte reserasti; vota nostra, que preveniendo aspiras, etiam adjuvando proseguere⁹⁵. Per eundem *etc.*

Ad omnes horas post antiphonam per totas octavas dicatur, Hec dies quam fecit Dominus; exultemus et letemur in ea⁹⁶.

Ad vesperas. Hymnus, Ad cenam agni^a providi *etc.*⁹⁷. *Post Magnificat antiphona*, Si consurrexistis cum Christo que SURSUM^b sunt querite, Aleluya⁹⁸. *Lectio ex Joanne ca. 20*, Exiit ergo Petrus *etc. usque ad* et hec dixit mihi.

^c HYMNI HUIUS DIEI USQUE AD ASCENSIONEM DOMINI DICANTUR.

Feria 2^a.

Lectio 4 ex Marc. ca. 16, Et cum transisset sabbathum *usque ad* nec illis crediderunt.

Ad vesperas ex Joanne cap. 20 lectio, Cum ergo sero esset *usque ad* in nomine ejus.

Feria tertia.

Lectio 4 ex. Luc. ca. 24, Una autem sabbathi *usque ad* quod factum fuerat.

⁹⁴ In S. this is, as here, the ant. on *Benedictus*.

⁹⁵ The prayer of lauds also in S.

⁹⁶ From S. (I, dcccxv—xvi); substantially the same in Q. (p. 58).

⁹⁷ From Q.; in S. this hymn was not begun until the second vespers of Low Sunday.

⁹⁸ This commencement of the epistle of the mass of Holy Saturday and little chapter of prime and none on Easter day, does not appear to be used as ant., resp. or verse in the Breviary.

^a Originally written "magni".

^b The scribe had written "Christi".

^c Cranmer originally wrote "Invitatorium et hymni"; the first two words have been crossed through.

Ad vespervas, Lectio ex Joanne ca. 21, Postea manifestavit se etc. usque ad. cum surrexisset a mortuis.

Feria iii^{ta}.

Ex Luc. cap. 24, Et ecce duo ex illis usque ad in fractione panis.

(fol. 144b.) *Ad vespervas. Lectio ex Joanne ca. 21, Cum ergo prandidissent usque ad qui scribendi sunt libros^a.*

Dominica prima post pascha.

Antiphona, Si consurrexistis cum Christo, que sursum sunt querite, ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens; que sursum sunt sapite, non que super terram, Alleluya⁹⁹. Hec sola antiphona dicatur super psalmos tam ad vespervas quam ad matutinas ET LAUDES usque ad Ascensionem Domini. Oratio. Concede quesumus omnipotens Deus, ut qui resurrectionis dominice solennia colimus, innovatione spiritus tui a morte anime resurgamus⁹⁹. Per Christum etc.

AD MATUTINAS. INVITATORIUM, ALLELUYA, SURREXIT DOMINUS VERE. VENITE ADOREMUS EUM, ALLELUYA. HOC INVITATORIUM DICATUR USQUE AD ASCENSIONEM DOMINI.¹⁰⁰ *Lectio iii^{ta} ex Luc. 24, Dum autem hec usque ad benedicentes Deum. Amen.*

Dominica 2^a.

Oratio. Deus, qui (in)^b filii tui humilitate jacentem mundum erexisti, fidelibus tuis perpetuam concede letitiam; ut quos perpetue mortis eripuisti casibus, gaudiis facias sempiternis perfrui. Per eundem etc.

⁹⁹ The prayer of the vespers on Easter day in S.

¹⁰⁰ Derived from S. (I, dcccxcii).

a "Invitatorium et hymni hujus diei usque ad Ascensionem dicantur"; this is crossed through.

b "in" omitted in MS., seemingly by accident.

Dominica 3^a.

Oratio. Deus, qui errantibus ut in viam possint redire justitie veritatis tue lumen ostendis: da cunctis, qui christiana professione censentur, et illa respuere que huic inimica sunt nomini ^a, et ea que sunt apta ^b sectari. Per Dominum *etc.*

(fol. 145a.)

Dominica iii^a.

Oratio. Deus, qui fidelium mentes unius efficis voluntatis: da populis ^c tuis id amare quod precipis, id desiderare quod promittis ^d; ut inter mundanas varietates ibi nostra fixa sint corda, ubi vera sunt gaudia. Per Dominum *etc.*

Dominica v^a.

Oratio. Deus, a quo bona cuncta procedunt: largire supplicibus tuis ut cogitemus te inspirante que recta sunt, et te gubernante eadem faciamus. Per Dominum *etc.*

Ascensio Domini.

Ad vespers. Hymnus. Jesu nostra redemptio ¹⁰¹ *etc.*
Antiphona. Ascendens Christus in altum captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus, Aleluya. ¹⁰² *Oratio.*
 Concede quesumus omnipotens Deus. ut qui hodierna die Unigenitum tuum, redemptorem nostrum, ad celos ascendisse credimus, ipsi quoque mente in celestibus habitemus. ¹⁰³ Per eundem *etc.*

¹⁰¹ In Q. the hymn for vespers; in S. for compline.

¹⁰² See the Alleluia of the mass of the Ascension and its octave day; and the second resp. of matins on Friday after the Ascension in S.

¹⁰³ In Q., the prayer at vespers; in S. it is not begun until lauds.

a originally "nomine".

b originally "aperta".

c populus. MS.

d originally "permittis".

Ad matutinas. Invitatorium, Christum Dominum ascendentem in celum Venite adoremus, Aleluia.¹⁰⁴ *Hymnus*. Eterne Rex altissime¹⁰⁵ etc. *Antiphona*, Ascendit Deus in jubilo et Dominus in voce tube, Aleluya.¹⁰⁶ *Lectio prima ex Esai.* 63, Quis est qui venit etc. usque ad cunctis diebus seculi. *Lectio 2^a ex Act.* 1^o, Primum quidem sermonem etc. usque ad euntem in celum.

(fol. 145b). *Lectio tertia ex Marc. ult.* Novissime autem recumbentibus usque ad sequentibus signis.

AD LAUDES. *Antiphona*, Nisi ego abiero paracletus non veniet ad vos. Si autem abiero, mittam eum^a ad vos Alleluya.¹⁰⁷

AD VESPERAS. ANTIPHONA, O REX GLORIE DOMINE VIRTUTUM, QUI TRIUMPHATOR HODIE SUPER OMNES CELOS ASCENDISTI; NE DERELINQUAS NOS ORPHANOS, SED MITTE PROMISSUM PATRIS IN NOS SPIRITUM VERITATIS, ALLELUYA.¹⁰⁸

Lectio^b ex Ephes. 4, Obsecro itaque vos usque ad sui in charitate.

Nihil deinceps mutetur usque ad penthecosten preter lectiones.

Penthecoste.

Ad vespervas. Hymnus, Jam Christus astra¹⁰⁹ etc.

¹⁰⁴ From Q.; S. has not "dominum".

¹⁰⁵ Agreeing with both S. and Q.

¹⁰⁶ See the Alleluia of the mass of the Ascension; and the verse and resp. at lauds and the hours; but "jubilatione" of the S. Missal and Breviary is corrected into "jubilo" in accordance with the Vulgate.

¹⁰⁷ This ant. is made up (perhaps from memory) of the ant. on *Benedictus* at lauds on Saturday after Ascension in S., and John XVI. 7 in the Vulgate. (cf. second resp. of matins on Friday after Ascension).

¹⁰⁸ This is the ant. on *Magnificat* of the second vespers of the feast also in S.

¹⁰⁹ From S. (in Q. this hymn is at matins).

^a Originally, "eam".

^b "ad vespervas"; crossed through.

Antiphona, Veni sancte spiritus; reple tuorum corda fidelium, et tui amoris in eis ignem accende.¹¹⁰ ORATIO SCRIBATUR POST LECTIONEM.^a *Oratio*. Deus, qui corda fidelium sancti Spiritus illustratione docuisti: da nobis in eodem spiritu recta sapere, et de ejus semper sancta consolatione gaudere.¹¹¹ Per Dominum nostrum. *Lectio ex Levit.* 23, Preceptum est sempiternum usque ad generationibus vestris.

Ad matutinas. Invitatorium, Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum. Venite adoremus EUM, Alleluia.¹¹² *Hymnus*, Impleta gaudent viscera¹¹³ etc. *Antiphona*, Emitte spiritum tuum et creabuntur, et renovabis faciem terre.¹¹⁴ *Lectio 1^a ex Joel* 2^o, Noli timere terra etc. usque ad Dominus vocaverit. *Lectio 2^a ex Act.* 2, Et cum complerentur dies etc. usque ad musto pleni sunt isti. (fol. 146a). *Lectio 3^a ex Joanne* 14, Si quis diligit me usque ad Surgite, eamus hinc.

Ad laudes, Antiphona, Accipite Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata remittuntur eis, Alleluia.¹¹⁵

Hoc die ante initium misse cantetur hymnus Veni creator Spiritus etc.¹¹⁶

Ad vesperas. Antiphona, Hodie completi sunt dies penthecostes, Alleluia: hodie Spiritus sanctus in igne

¹¹⁰ Part of the antiphon on the psalms at the first vespers of the feast in S.

¹¹¹ This prayer is at first vespers in Q.; in S. it begins at Lauds "Hodierna die" of S. and Q. is omitted. The word "sancta" does not occur in Q. S. or York. It is maintained in the second scheme and has found its way into the Prayer Book of 1549 "(His holy comfort)".

¹¹² In S. and Q.; but the addition "eum" is found in neither.

¹¹³ The hymn for Lauds in S.; not in Q.

¹¹⁴ The third ant. of the first nocturn in S.

¹¹⁵ As in S.

¹¹⁶ From S. (I, mviii).

discipulis apparuit, et tribuit eis charismatum dona: misit eos in universum mundum predicare et testificari. Qui crediderit et baptizatus^a fuerit salvus erit, Aleluia.¹¹⁵
Lectio ex Act. Stans autem Petrus *usque ad* salvus erit.

Feria secunda.

Lectio 4 ex Act. 2^o, His auditis compuncti sunt *usque ad* panis et orationibus.

Feria tertia.

Lectio 4 ex Act. 10, Adhuc loquente Petro *usque ad* apud eos aliquot diebus.

Feria 4.

Lectio 4 ex Act. 19, Factum est autem *etc.* linguis et prophetabant.

In Festo Trinitatis.

Ad vesp̄ras. Hymnus, Adesto sancta Trinitas^{117 b} *etc.*
Antiphona, Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in celo: Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus; et hi tres unum sunt¹¹⁸. *Oratio.* PONATUR POST LECTIONEM^c. Omnipotens sempiternus Deus, qui dedisti famulis tuis in confessione (fol. 146b) vere fidei eterne Trinitatis gloriam agnoscere, et in potentia majestatis adorare unitatem: quesumus ut in ejusdem fidei firmitate ab omnibus semper muniamur adversis¹¹⁵. Qui vivis *etc.* *Lectio ex Math.* 3^o, Tunc venit Jesus *usque ad* in quo mihi complacui.

¹¹⁷ As in S. and Q.

¹¹⁸ The little chapter of sext in S.

^a batizatus. MS.

^b "Trinitatis" MS.

^c In margin.

Completerium ut post Epiphaniam.

Ad matutinas. Invitatorium, Deum verum unum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in unitate, Venite adoremus ¹¹⁹. *Hymnus*, O Pater Sancte, mitis atque pie *etc.* ¹²⁰. *Antiphona*, Te invocamus, te laudamus, te adoramus, O beata Trinitas ¹²¹. *Lectio prima ex Gen.* 8, Apparuit autem Abrahe Dominus *etc. usque ad* ne transeas servum tuum. *Lectio 2^a ex Esai* 6, In anno quo mortuus est rex *usque ad* terra gloria ejus. *Lectio tertia ex Math.* 28, Undecim autem discipuli *usque ad* consummacionem seculi.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, Te Deum Patrem ingentum, Te Filium unigenitum, Te Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctam et individuum Trinitatem toto corde et ore confitemur, laudamus atque benedicimus: tibi gloria in secula ¹²².

Oratio ut supra.

Ad vespas. Antiphona, Spes nostra, salus nostra, honor noster, O beata Trinitas ¹²³. *Lectio ex 1 Joan.* 5, Quis est (fol. 147a) qui vincit *usque ad* et hi tres unum sunt.

*Feria 2.**et deinceps usque ad Adventum.*

Invitatorium, Laudemus Jesum Christum, quia ipse est redemptor omnium seculorum ¹²⁴. *Hymnus*, Primo

¹¹⁹ From S.

¹²⁰ The hymn of lauds in S.

¹²¹ The second ant. of the first nocturn in S. (but "Te adoramus, Te laudamus" in S.).

¹²² The ant. on *Magnificat* at second vespers in S.

¹²³ The second ant. of the second nocturn in S.

¹²⁴ The invitatory of the Sunday from the first Sunday after Trinity to September in S.

dierum ¹²⁵ *etc. Antiphona*, Adaperiat Dominus cor nostrum in lege sua, et in preceptis suis, et faciat pacem ¹²⁶.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, Omnis creatura celi et terre benedicat Dominum; hymnum dicat et superexaltet eum in secula ¹²⁷. *Oratio*. Adesto supplicationibus nostris omnipotens Deus: et quibus fiduciam sperande venie indulges, consuete misericordie tribue benignus effectum. Per Christum Dominum *etc.* ¹²⁸.

Ad vesperras. Hymnus, Lucis Creator optime *etc.* ¹²⁹.

Antiphona, Vespertina oratio ascendat ad te Domine, et descendat super nos misericordia tua ¹³⁰.

ANTIPHONE HUIUS DIEI USQUE AD DOMINI DICANTUR ADVENTUM.

In Festo Corporis Christi.

Hymnus, Pange lingua *etc.* 2. Nobis datus 3. In supreme ^a. 4. Verbum caro. 5. Tantum ergo. 6. Genitori ¹³¹. *Antiphona*, Panis quem ego dabo caro mea est, pro ^b mundi vita ¹³². *Lectio ex Sap.* 16, Angelorum esca

¹²⁵ The hymn of the Sunday from the first Sunday after the octave of the Epiphany to Lent in S.

¹²⁶ The ant. at *Magnificat* on Saturday next after 27 September, and invitatory throughout October in S.

¹²⁷ For the few occasions on which this ant. (fourth of lauds) was said in S., see II, 28.

¹²⁸ It does not appear what suggested the use of this prayer (the prayer *super populum* of the mass of Monday in the second week of Lent) at this place.

¹²⁹ The vesper hymn for the Sunday and ferial office from the first Sunday after Trinity to Advent in S.

¹³⁰ The verse and resp. after the hymn of vespers on Saturday from the Saturday after Trinity Sunday to Advent, in S.

¹³¹ This arrangement of the hymns is from Q.; in S. *Pange lingua* is at matins, and *Sacris solemniis* at vespers.

¹³² Part of the fourth resp. of matins in S.

^a "sempiterne". MS.

^b In MS. originally: "est quem ego dabo pro".

nutrivisti *etc. usque* jugiter sentiamus. ORATIO. DEUS, QUI NOBIS SUB SACRAMENTO MIRABILI PASSIONIS TUE MEMORIAM RELIQUISTI: TRIBUE QUESUMUS ITA NOS CORPORIS ET SANGUINIS TUI SACRA MYSTERIA VENERARI, UT REDEMPTIONIS TUE FRUCTUM IN NOBIS JUGITER SENTIAMUS. QUI VIVIS ET REGNAS.

Ad matutinas. Invitatorium, Christum Salvatorem et panem (fol. 147b) vite celestis, Venite adoremus ¹³³. *Hymnus*, Sacris solenniis *etc.* ¹³¹ *Antiphona*,^a Ego sum panis vivus qui de celo descendi; si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane vivet in eternum. ¹³⁴ *Lectio I^a Exod.* 16, Locutus est Dominus ad Moysen *etc. usque* ad sol liquefiebat. *Lectio 2^a ex Paul. primo Corr.* 11, Ego enim accepi a Domino *usque* AD cum venero disponam. *Lectio 3 ex Joanne* 6, Patres vestri manducaverunt manna in deserto *usque* ad vivet in eternum.

Ad laudes. Antiphona, O sacrum convivium in quo Christus sumitur; recolitur memoria passionis ^b ejus: mens impletur gratia et future glorie nobis pignus datur. ¹³⁵

Ad vesperas. Antiphona, Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet et ego in eo. ¹³⁶ *Lectio, I ad Corr.* 10, Calix benedictionis *usque* ad et mense demoniorum.

*Dominica prima post.
festum Trinitatis.*

Here follow merely the collects from the first to the

¹³³ This invitatory, worthy of the feast, appears to be original.

¹³⁴ The ant. on *Benedictus* at lauds in S., which has at the end *Alleluya*.

¹³⁵ The ant. on *Magnificat* at second vespers in S., which has at the end *Alleluya*.

¹³⁶ The seventh resp. of matins in S.

^a "Antiphone". MS.

^b In MS. originally: "tue passionis".

twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity. They are those of Sarum. The following points only require notice.

1st Sunday: the word "fortitudo" omitted by the scribe is added by Cranmer.

4th Sunday: "nihil sanctum" omitted by the scribe is added by Cranmer.

6th Sunday: "diligentibus *nomen*" is corrected to "*te*" (so Sarum).

9th Sunday: the scribe here after "propitius" left a blank; Cranmer fills in the missing words "et agendi". This shews that the scribe copied even the prayers from a rough draft and not from the print.

14th Sunday: "ut mereamur assequi" of Sarum is changed in the MS. to "ut possimus assequi".

15th Sunday: the scribe misreads evidently an abbreviation in a draft before him as "clementiam" instead of "ecclesiam".

24th Sunday: "a peccatorum nostrorum nexibus quæ" in Sarum and Quignon; the MS. omits "nostrorum"; the Prayer Book of 1549 reads "from the bands of all those sins which".

APPENDIX III.

CRANMER'S SCHEME FOR MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

The preface and rubrics of the scheme for Morning and Evening Prayer described in Chapter III are here printed in full, as well as the benedictions before the lessons. The hymns and collects however, which it would be of no interest to reproduce at length, are only noted. The preface shows in parallel columns (1) those passages of Quignon's preface used by Cranmer, (2) the latin draft given in the manuscript, and (3) the english print as it appeared in the Prayer Book of 1549. It will be thus possible to see at a glance what, on revision, was omitted and what was added. A minute comparison of the three texts will throw light on Cranmer's mind and methods.

Although so bald, the scheme is of exceptional interest as showing the step whereby the transition was made from the ancient ecclesiastical system of "Hours" to the printed order of Morning and Evening Prayer.

The hymns intended to be used in this scheme were taken, not from the existing breviaries, but from the *Elucidatorium Ecclesiasticum* of Clich-

toveus.¹ This will appear from the following considerations. Of the twenty-six hymns given in the manuscript five do not occur in the Sarum breviary. One of these, *Agnoscat omne saeculum* is in the York breviary (and Clichtoveus); but the other four are not to be found in any english office book. Three of these, viz. *Magno salutis gaudio*, *Hymnum dicamus Domino*, and *Festum nunc celebre*, are given by Clichtoveus from foreign breviaries, and they seem specially to have been used in Germany. Finally the fifth, *O Pater summae Deitatis ortus*, assigned to the vespers of friday throughout the year, is not an ancient hymn at all; but an imitation by Clichtoveus himself of the hymn *O Pater Sancte, mitis atque pie*, and acknowledged as such by the author.²

Next, the hymns in the MS. in many cases follow not the reading of the english breviaries, but that given by Clichtoveus, *e. g.*, in the hymn *Te lucis ante terminum*, Clichtoveus and Cranmer's MS. read "ac custodia" in place of "ad custodiam"; in the *Jesu Salvator saeculi*, Clichtoveus and the MS. reverse the ancient english order of strophes 3 and 4³.

Finally, whilst the breviaries give a doxology to every hymn, the major part of those given in the MS. are without doxology and on comparing them with Clichtoveus' collection, it appears that this is given when, and only when, Clichtoveus gives it. There can be no doubt therefore that the hymns

¹ Cranmer's copy of this book (ed. 1516), now at the British Museum, bears both his signature and Lumley's.

² "Et quoniam" he writes (f. 14b) "*piam continet et religiosam ad Deum orationem, loco illius (servata eadem sententia) hymnum hoc modo lusimus, O Pater summae &c.*" as in the MS.

³ See further examples in the notes.

in the MS. are taken not from the existing breviaries but from the book of Clichtoveus.

In regard to the mode in which the hymns are used, it may be said roughly that in the proposed scheme the Vespers hymn is assigned to matins and the ancient Compline hymn to vespers. The exact changes will be found indicated in the notes.

This scheme begins with the preface, and bears no title in the manuscript.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

. . horarias preces
quas canonicas
etiam appellamus
... (p. XIX).

Et profecto si
quis modum pre-
candi olim a ma-
joribus traditum
diligenter consy-
deret, horum om-
nium ab ipsis
habitam esse ra-
tionem manifesto
deprehendet. (p.
XX).

(fol. 7a) Nihil
unquam ab ho-
minibus tanta
cautione excogit-
atum, aut tanta
firmitate stabilit-
um quod vetus-
tate et temporum
lapsu non cor-
runperetur.

Hoc et in pre-
cibus illis quas
horarias sive ca-
nonicas appella-
mus usu venisse
conspicimus.

Quarum ratio-
nem a priscis
ecclesie Patribus
institutam si quis
diligenter exqui-
rat et examinet,
eam sane nec
inepte nec incom-
mode ordinatam
fuisse comperiet.

Illi siquidem
tali modo rem

There was never
any thing by the
art of man so
well devised, or
so surely estab-
lished which (in
continuance of
time) hath not
been corrupted:
as (among other
things) it may
plainly appear by
the common pray-
ers of the Church
commonly called
divine service,

the first origi-
nal and ground
whereof, if a man
would search out
by the ancient
fathers, he shall
find that the same
was not ordained
but of a good
purpose and for
a great advance-
ment of godli-
ness.

For they so or-
dered the matter

QUIGNON'S PREFACE, 1ST TEXT. Cambridge reprint.	MS. REG. 7 B. IV.	PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (1549).
	<p>disposuerant ut singulis annis omnia sacra biblia perlegerentur, et una cum anni circulo canonice quoque scripture circulus revolveretur.</p> <p>Volentes nimirum uti clerici et ecclesiarum antistites, assidua sacrarum literarum lectione meditationeque, et ipsi ad arduam virtutis viam capescendam incitarentur, et alios exhortandi in doctrina sana convincendique eos qui contradicunt facultatem sibi compararent; et plebes auditis quotidie in cetu sacro sacris divini verbi lectionibus in dies magis ac magis in rerum divinarum cognit-</p>	<p>that all the whole Bible (or the greater part thereof) should be read over once in the year,</p> <p>intending thereby that the clergy, and specially such as were ministers of the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation of God's word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able also to exhort other by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries of the truth. And further that the people (by daily hearing of holy scripture read in the church)</p>

QUIGNON'S PREFACE, 1ST TEXT, Cambridge reprint.	MS. REG. 7 B. IV.	PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (1549).
<p>Sed factum est nescio quo pacto hominum negligentia ut paulatim a sanctissimis illis veterum patrum institutis discederetur. (p. XX).</p> <p>Nam primum libri sacrae scripturae, qui statis anni temporibus erant perlegendi,</p>	<p>ione proficerent ac in Deum pietate accenderentur.</p> <p>Sed (proh dolor) illam maiorum tam sanctam tam pulcram tam bene coherentem ordinationem, superveniens ætas quam fœde conspurcaverat convulseratque et tanquam membratim dilaceraverat.</p> <p>Nam librorum seriem continuam et integram nusquam observamus. Sed vel fragmenta hinc inde decerpimus et consarcinamus, nihil quid preceserat quidve se-</p>	<p>should continually profit more, and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion.</p> <p>But these many years past the godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken and neglected by planting in uncertain stories, legends, responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations and synodals¹,</p>

¹ See below from Quignon's preface the passage "varias commemorationum" &c.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

vixdum incœpti
a precantibus
praetermittuntur
(p. XX).

¹ Ut exemplo
esse possunt liber
Genesis qui inci-
pitur in Septua-
gesima, et liber
Isaie qui in ad-
ventu, quorum
vix singula capi-
tula per legimus,
ac eodem modo
caetera veteris
testamenti volu-
mina degustamus
magis quam legi-
mus. Nec secus
accidit in Evan-
gelia et reliquam
scripturam novi
testamenti,

quatur attenden-
tes, vel initia
tantum librorum
delibantes vix
tribus decursis
capitulis cetera
pretermittimus.

Sic librum
Esaie in adventu,
sic librum Gene-
sis in Septuage-
sima inchoamus,
sed inchoamus
tantum, ad um-
belicum (fol. 7. b)
non perducimus.

Haud secus
Evangelia et novi
testamenti scrip-
turas omnes con-
taminamus, laxa-
tis ² librorum om-
nium compagi-
bus omnia mis-
centes, transpo-
nentes, confund-
entes.

that commonly
when any book
of the Bible was
begun, before
three or four
chapters were
read out, all the
rest were unread.

And in this
sort the book of
Esaie was begun
in Advent, and
the book of Ge-
nesis in Septua-
gesima, but they
were only begun
and never read
through.

After a like
sort were other
books of holy
scripture used.

¹ the passage „Ut exemplo . . . comparanda” is not in the preface
of the second text.

² luxatis. MS.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

¹ quorum in loco
successerunt alia
nec utilitate cum
his nec gravitate
comparanda ..
.. (p. XX).

... Tum historiae
Sanctorum tam
inculte et tam
negligenti iudicio
scriptae leguntur
ut nec auctorita-
tem habere vide-
antur nec gra-
vitatem. (p. XX).

Quid quod fri-
vola quedam et
anilibus fabulis
non absimilia
introducta sint et
digna habita pre
quibus divinorum
oraculorum lectio
loco moveretur.

Nam historie
sanctorum fere
tam crasso iudicio
collecte sunt et
stilo tam incon-
dito descriptae ut
lector cordato
fastidium facile
pariant.

And moreover
whereas S. Pau¹
would have such
language spoken
to the people in
the church as
they might un-

¹ Also p. XXIV: "Deinde in illo (the old breviary) sanctorum historiae non paucae leguntur tam rudi stilo, tam sine rerum delectu et gravitate, ut sint interdum contemptui atque derisui legentibus."

<p>QUIGNON'S PREFACE, 1ST TEXT. Cambridge reprint.</p>	<p>MS. REG. 7 B. IV.</p>	<p>PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (1549).</p>
<p>¹Deinde psalmorum plerisque, qui singulis hebdomadae diebus erant destinati, rejectis, pauci quidam toto fere anno repetuntur. (p. XX.)</p> <p>agitatione lin-</p>	<p>Preterea quum antiqui illi Patres psalmorum librum in septem portiones, quas nocturnas vocant, distribuissent, nunc omissis reliquis pauci tantum quidam illique magis labiorum strepitu quam</p>	<p>derstand and have profit by hearing the same; the service in this Church of England (these many years) hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understood not, so that they have heard with their ears only: and their hearts, spirit and mind have not been edified thereby.</p> <p>And furthermore notwithstanding that the ancient fathers had divided the psalms into seven portions, whereof every one was called a nocturn, now of late time a few of them have been daily</p>

¹ This passage is not in the preface to the second text.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

guae magis quam
intentione men-
tis inculcantur.
(p. XX).

¹ Accedit tam
perplexus ordo
tamque difficilis
precandi ratio,

ut interdum paulo
minor opera in
inquirendo ponat-
ur quam cum
inveneris in le-
gendo (p. XX).

animi pensicula-
tione quotidie re-
plicantur. Nequid
interim dicam de
regularum multi-
tudine et difficul-
tate, de multifariis
officiorum trans-
mutacionibus ac
ceteris rerum
labyrinthis qui-
bus librorum
evolvendorum
ratio tam impe-
dita et perplexa
facta est, ut non
raro plus negotii
sit investigare
quod est legen-
dum quam ubi
inventum est le-
gere; eoque res
devenerat ut ars
quedam inde fue-
rit constituta, ac
peritum artificem
esse oporteret qui
Ordinalem (sic
enim vocant me-

said (and oft re-
peated) and the
rest utterly omit-
ted. Moreover
the number
and hardness of
the rules, called
the pie, and the
manifold chang-
ings of the service
were the cause
that to turn the
book only was
so hard and in-
tricate a matter,
that there was
more business to
find out what
should be read
than to read it
when it was found
out.

¹ Also p. XXV, "Postremo in illo summa erat confusio propter regu-
larum multitudinem et perplexitatem, et festorum translationem et varias
commemorationum &c. &c. inculcationes."

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

thodicum artis il-
lius librum) probe
intelligeret.

Nos igitur tanta
incommoda con-
siderantes eisque
remedium adhi-
beri cupientes,
Methodum in me-
dium damus juxta
quam id non in-
concinne fieri
posse arbitra-
mur¹, descripto
in eum usum
indice lucido fa-
cili et cuivis in-
telligibili, unum
hunc scopum
maxime conside-
rantes ut videlicet
sacre scripture
filum et series
ubique quoad
fieri potest inte-
gre et indivulse
continuetur, et ut
exoticorum scrip-
torum² quam
minimum inter-

These inconve-
niences therefore
considered, here
is set forth such
an order whereby
the same shall be
redressed. And
for a readiness in
this matter here
is drawn out a
Kalendar for that
purpose which is
plain and easy to
be understood,
wherein (so much
as may be) the
reading of holy
Scripture is set
forth that all
things shall be
done in order,
without breaking
one piece thereof
from another.

¹ "Arbitremur". MS.

² "laciniis" or some such word, is omitted.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

¹ Omissis antiphonis, capitulis et responsoriis ac multis hymnis ceterisque id genus rebus Scripturae sacrae lectionem impediens (p. XXI).

Relicti sunt etiam ex hymnis qui plurimum omnium habere visi sunt auctoritatis ac gravitatis (p. XXI).

² et sanctorum historiis quas ex probatis et gravibus auctoribus graecis et latinis decerpimus. (p. XXI).

texatur. Hanc ob causam Antiphonas, Responsoria, Inventoria,³ Capitula ac cetera id genus sacre lectionis cursum interrumpentia pleraque resecurimus. (fol. 8a.) Hymnos tantum pauculos qui reliquis plus vetustatis et venustatis in se continere videbantur relinquentes, et delectorum quorundam atque extra omnem aleam positorum, sanctorum indubitatas historias, quas ex idoneis scriptoribus graecis latinisque desumi ac deflo-

For this cause be cut off Anthems, Responses, Invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of Scripture.

¹ The preface of the second text of Quignon differs, is more diffuse as to antiphons, &c. and legends of saints; and says nothing as to hymns.

² Also p. XXIV. "Omnia sunt cultiora, graviora, et ex historia ecclesiastica, et auctoribus probatis gravibusque decerpta."

³ So MS.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE, 1ST TEXT. Cambridge reprint.	MS. REG. 7 B. IV.	PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (1549).
<p>.... fieri non potuit ut regulas omnino vitaremus, sed nos tam raras et perspicuas regulas disposuimus ut eas</p>	<p>rari fecimus. Porro sanctos illos dumtaxat rejecimus quorum dies solemnes vidimus a plebecula perperam ac superstitione celebrari, aut qui de vita et moribus nobis fuerunt suspecti, aut quorum historie apud probatos autores non extabant; aut denique cum duo pluresve in eundem diem incidissent eos qui ex omni numero minus idonei aut necessarii videbantur, pretermittendos judicavimus. Regulas autem quoniam omnino vitare non potuimus, eas tamen certe et numero paucissimas et multo magis claras</p>	<p>Yet because there is no remedy but that of necessity there must be some rules, therefore certain rules are here set forth,</p>

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST EDITION.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

cuius facile sit
intelligere. (p.
XXI).

Itaque si quis
diligenter anim-
advertat et vetus
patrum consilium
institutumque
consyderet, plane
intelliget hoc
breviarium non
tam esse novum
inventum,

quam breviarii
veteris in commo-
diorem et cultio-
rem formam res-
titutionem.
sublatis quibus-
dam rebus quae
medio tempore

atque intellectu
faciles reliqui-
mus.

Habetis igitur
hic precandi
formam non a
nobis noviter
inventam, sed
magis veterem
illam a Patribus
traditam (si con-
siliium illorum
recte reputetis)
ad pristinum et
primitivum usum
ac nitorem, quan-
tum fieri potuit
a nobis, restitu-
tam, aut certe
aliam illi veteri
non multo dissi-
mitem ac omnino
multo utiliorem
commodiorem-
que illa quam
hactenus in ma-
nibus habetis. Uti-
liorem quidem
quod, repurgatis
ac rejectis pluri-

which, as they
be few in num-
ber, so they be
plain and easy
to be understand-
ed.

So that here
you have an
order for prayer
(as touching the
reading of holy
scripture) much
agreeable to the
mind and pur-
pose of the
old fathers,

and a great deal
more profitable
and commodious
than that which
of late was used.
It is more pro-
fitable because
here are left out

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

praeter iudicium
et gravitatem
obrepserant (p.
XXIV.) In hoc
autem (breviario)
legitur singulis
annis magna et
praecipua pars
veteris testamenti
et totum novum
&c. (p. XXIV).

mis que tum inu-
tilia tum etiam
incerta atque in-
epta adjecta fue-
rant, nil fere
nisi meras τὰς
Θεοπνεύστας γρά-
φας¹ comprehen-
dat,

easque ordine
quam hactenus
magis perspicuo
ac directo qui
maxime legentis
et intellectum ad-
juvat et memo-
riam confirmat.

Commodiorem
vero vel propter
legendi succinc-
tam breviter
vel propter ordi-
nis simplicem cla-
ritatem vel deni-
que propter regu-

many things,
whereof some be
untrue, some un-
certain, some vain
and superstitious,
and is ordained
nothing to be read
but the very pure
word of God, the
Holy Scriptures,
or that which
is evidently
grounded on the
same, and that in
such language
and order as is
most easy and
plain for the un-
derstanding both
of readers and
hearers.

It is also more
commodious,
both for the short-
ness thereof, and
for the plainness
of the order, and
for that the rules
be few and easy.

Porro quan-
quam non fuit
nobis propositum,
brevitati, sed
commoditati pre-
cantium consu-
lere, utrumque ta-
men, ut speramus,

¹ Θεοπνεύστας MS.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE, 1ST TEXT. Cambridge reprint.	MS. REG. 7. B. IV.	PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (1549).
<p>consecuti sumus. (p. XXIV.)</p> <p>varias commemorationum, versiculorum, responsoriorum, antiphonarum et similium rerum laboriosas ac parum graves inculcationes et iterationes quæ nec ad pietatem nec ad cognitionem scripturæ sacræ magnopere conducebant. (p. XXIV). Qui noster ordo non parum facit ad temporis brevitatem et laboris levamen (p. XXV).</p>	<p>larum paucitatem (fol. 8b) facilitatemque.</p> <p>Adde huc quod et cramben illam recoctam sententiarum earundem et cantionum tocies coccycis in morem iterandarum, sustulimus ad legentium non mediocre commodum¹ et levamen.</p> <p>Preterea juxta modum hunc a nobis ordinatum non aliis opus erit portiforiis sive breviariis quam ipsis bibliis</p>	<p>Furthermore the Curates shall need none other books for their public service but this book and the Bible, by the</p>

¹ So in MS.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

eoque erit sump-
tus minor in li-
bris comparandis.

Cumque hacte-
nus in serviciis
dicendis decan-
tandisque tanta
fuerit diversitas
ut pene plus
quam babylonica
linguarum confu-
sio videri possit,
dum alii usum
Sarisburiensem,
alii Hereforden-
sem, alii Bango-
rensem, alii Ebo-
racensem emu-
lantur, et religio-
sorum tam mul-
tifarie cohortes
suum queque
seorsim habue-
rint usum,
nunc in unum
eundemque usum
ecclesie omnes
per universum

means whereof
the people shall
not be at so
great charge for
books as in time
past they have
been.

And where
heretofore there
hath been great
diversity in say-
ing and singing
in churches
within this realm:
some following
Salisbury use,
some Hereford
use, some the use
of Bangor, some
York and some
of Lincoln.

Now from hen-
ceforth all the
whole realm shall
have but one use.

QUIGNON'S PREFACE,
1ST TEXT.
Cambridge reprint.

MS. REG. 7 B. IV.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER
(1549).

Si cui autem laboriosum in hoc breviario videbitur pleraque omnia ex libro legi, cum multa in alio quae propter frequentem repetitionem ediscuntur memoriter pronuncientur, compenset cum hoc labore cognitionem scripturae sacrae, quae sic in dies augeat, et intentionem animi, quam Deus ante omnia in precantibus requirit (hanc enim majorem legentibus quam memoriter proferentibus adesse necesse est) et hujusmodi laborem non modo fructuosum, sed etiam salutarem judicabit. (p. XXV).

hoc regnum facile coalescent. Porro si quis hanc, nostram viam in eo laboriosam judicaverit quod hic pleraque omnia ex libro sunt legenda quum antea per frequentem repetitionem multa memoriter proferre didicissent, is si compenset cum labore isto tum utilitatem cognitionis quam legendo quotidie majorem acquirat, tum contemplationis fructum, qui major legentibus quam memoriter verba recitantibus provenire solet, laborem hujusmodi haud dubie tolerare ac perferre equo animo non gravabitur. Valete et fruimini.

And if any would judge this way more painful, because that all this must be read upon the book, whereas before by reason of so oft repetition they could say many things by heart: if those men will weigh their labour with the profit in knowledge, which daily they shall obtain by reading upon the book,

they will not refuse the pain in consideration of the great profit that shall ensue thereof.

(fol. 9a.)

C A N O N.

Sacram Scripturam¹ in Divinis Officiis hoc ordine legendam disposuimus.

Psalterium quidem duodecies: Evangelia autem Epistole et Apostolorum acta ter singulis annis repetentur. Reliqua vero sacra Biblia universa semel dumtaxat in anno perlegentur.

De lectione psalmorum.

Psalterium quolibet mense semel absolvetur. Sed quoniam mensium magna est inequalitas, eos sic ad equalitatem quandam in primis redigendos censuimus.

Quilibet mensis quantum ad hanc rationem attinet, justum numerum triginta dierum obtinebit.

Quia igitur Januarius et Martius tricenarium numerum uno die superant, intermedius eorum Februarius qui 28 dies tantummodo complectitur utrinque diem unum mutuabitur. Et sic Februarii psalterium ultimo die Januarii incipietur et primo Martii terminabitur.

Rursus quoniam Maius, Julius, Augustus, October et December uno die singuli abundant, in omnium istorum mensium ultimis diebus eosdem ipsos psalmos volumus iterari qui penultimis eorundem diebus deserviebant, ut in sequentis semper mensis capite psalterium denuo inchoetur.

Atque isto quidem modo fiet ut omnes ex equo mensis justo tricennorum dierum numero, quod ad hanc rationem attinet, (fol. 9b.) circumscribantur, ultimis

¹ "Scripturam" in MS.

semper istorum quinque mensium diebus cum penultimis eorundem pro uno eodemque die computatis.

Nunc quo pacto psalterium quoque huic dierum numero exequavimus. accipite. Id autem tali potissimum ratione indicavimus uti singuli semper dies senos haberent psalmos sibi deservientes, nempe pro matutinis ternos et pro vespertinis itidem ternos.

At quum psalmore liber tantummodo 150 psalmos in sese ex suo corpore contineat qui vel quinquaginta dumtaxat psalmore quotidiana lectione in triginta diebus absumerentur, videlicet alios triginta ad suum cuique diei senarium perimplendum alicunde sufficere necesse erat; idque hoc pacto fecimus.

Psalmum 118 in viginti duas partes jam olim distinctum nos quoque pro viginti duobus psalmis distinctim recitari statuimus. Atque hinc viginti unus ad desideratum psalmore tricenarium numerum suggeruntur.¹ Psalmum insuper nonum juxta Hebraicam dispositionem in duos diduximus, eruntque 29. (22)² Atque hactenus quidem nihil est a nobis divisum cujus exemplum non aut in Hebraica litera aut in bibliis nostris invenimus. Jam ut octo psalmi qui adhuc desunt suppleantur octo psalmos longissimos singulos in duos desecimus, nempe 17, 67, 68, 77, 88, 104, 105 et 106;³ sicque tandem tricenarius psalmore qui desiderabatur numerus plene consummatur. Habemusque in toto psalmos satis multos qui seni in singulos dies distributi in regularem illum (de quo diximus) triginta dierum mensem sufficiant. Hucusque de psalmore ordinaria lectione.

¹ The following has been erased: "His adiciuntur septem sacra cantica jam diu inter psalmos decantari consueta."

² "22" is substituted for "29" in Cranmer's hand to meet the omission of the canticles.

³ This was originally written "Jam ut antiquus psalmus qui adhuc deest, suppleatur, canticum illud *Audite celi que loquar* (sic in duo desecimus)", and has been altered in Cranmer's hand as given above in the text.

(fol. 10a.) *De Lectione ceterarum
scripturarum.*

Nunc ceteras Scripturas quomodo in lectiones discriminavimus audietis. Eruntque quotidie matutine terne aut quaterne lectiones; vespertine bine. Addidimus et vespertinis precibus suas lectiones quo nimirum populus semper aliquid addisceret, rediretque de templis domum in verbo Dei instructor.

De Primis Lectionibus.

In primis lectionibus tum matutinis tum vespertinis universum Vetus Instrumentum preter Prophetas semel in anno perlegetur. Verum hic triginta novem capita longiora ad satisfaciendum dierum numero sunt divisa, et ex singulis bina constituta.

De Secundis Lectionibus.

Omnes Veteris Testamenti Prophete, cum Apocalipsi ex novo, quam (quoniam et ipsa prophetia est) reliquis sui generis adjungendam existimavimus, in secundis lectionibus matutinis recitabuntur. Ceterum hic quoque 85 prolixiora capita, ut lectionum numerus cum dierum numero adamussim quadraret coacti sumus discindere. Et sic totum vetus instrumentum est dispositum. Porro secundis lectionibus vespertinis Epistolas Paulinas una cum ceteris canonicis assignavimus, quas omnes ter in unius anni circulo percurremus. Hic autem unum tantummodo caput est divisum idque duntaxat in secunda et tertia repetitione.

(fol. 10b.) *De Tertiis Lectionibus.*

Postremo Evangelia cum Actis Apostolicis in tercias lectiones matutinas dispartivimus, que etiam ter in anno universa revolvuntur. Denique et hic ut lectionum et dierum calculus conveniret, quinque capita longiora medium secuimus.

Atque hoc pacto a nobis universa biblia in diurna tanquam pensa sunt descripta ut et eorum terminus semper una cum anni termino claudatur; et revertente novi anni initio librorum quoque initium semper sit repetendum.

Illud preterea non est silentio pretermittendum quod in annis bisextilibus dies ille additicius qui in Februario intercalatur, idem per omnia servitium cum die qui precesserat observabit.

(fol. 11a.) *Series Officii Matutini.*

Nunc quo res fiat dilucidior, seriem pensi matutini quam observari volumus a capite ad calcem perscribemus.

Primum omnium dicatur *Oratio dominica* idque sermone vernaculo distinctius quam antehac solebat. Qua finita more solito incipiat *Domine labia* cum *Deus in adiutorium*, *Gloria patri*, et *Alleluia*, vel a Septuagesima ad Pascha *Laus tibi Domine* juxta inveteratam ecclesie consuetudinem.

Deinde pretermisso *Venite* (quod in classe sua inter psalmos semel in mense recitari satis est visum) cantetur *Hymnus*; quem finitum statim sequantur *tres psalmi* quorum quilibet suo *Gloria patri* terminetur.

Post hec rursus *Oratio dominica* recitetur in vulgari lingua apertius proferendo. Tum legantur *tres lectiones*. His rite peractis canatur *Te Deum*; et eo finito legatur *quarta lectio* si qua fuerit eo die legenda. Non erit autem nisi diebus dominicis, vel quum sancti cujuspiam natalis aut dies aliqui insignis aliquis inciderit cui quartam lectionem assignandam duxerimus. Nam hunc locum peculiariter sanctorum historiis et homeliis atque exhortacionibus tempori convenientibus destinavimus. Porro unaqueque lectio sive ad matutinas sive ad vespertinas horas cum *Jube Domine* et *benedictione* a sacerdote succinenda inchoetur, ac sua solita clausula

obsignabitur, nempe *Tu autem Domine etc.* Et respondeat totus chorus *Et ignosce peccatis nostris propter magnam misericordiam tuam.* Et legendas sive lectiones non intra cancellos ut hodie sed foris e suggestu ut apud veteres fieri consuevit censemus recitandas, idque sermone vernaculo, ut populus audiens atque etiam intelligens edificetur, et juxta Pauli institutionem respondere possit. *Amen.*

His omnibus finitis cantabitur *Benedictus*; deinde *Dominus vobiscum* cum *Oratione* et *Benedicamus Domino.* Et respondeatur semper *Laudemus et superexaltemus nomen ejus in secula. Amen.* (Fol. 116).

Et sic peractis Matutinis, singulis dominicis statim dicitur symbolum *Quicumque vult.* Quo terminato cum suo *Gloria patri* continuo dicet sacerdos has preces.

Ostende nobis Domine misericordiam tuam.

Respondeatur: Et salutare tuum da nobis.

V. *Dignare Domine die isto.*

R. *Sine peccato nos custodire.*

V. *Miserere nostri Domine.*

R. *Miserere nostri.*

V. *Fiat misericordia tua Domine super nos.*

R. *Quemadmodum speravimus in te.*

V. *Domine Deus virtutum converte nos.*

R. *Et ostende faciem tuam et salvi erimus.*

V. *Domine exaudi orationem nostram.*¹

R. *Et clamor noster*¹ *ad te veniat.*

V. *Dominus vobiscum.*

R. *Et cum spiritu tuo.*

*Oremus. Domine sancte Pater &c.*¹

V. *Dominus vobiscum.*

R. *Et cum.*

Benedicamus Domino.

¹ This change is significant.

² As in Sarum at prime.

R. *Laudemus et superexaltemus nomen ejus in secula. Amen.*

Series Officii Vespertini.

Oratio dominica.

Deus in adjutorium.

Gloria patri vel Laus¹ tibi.

Tunc Hymnus.

Tres psalmi.

Pater noster.

Due lectiones cum suis Benedictionibus.

Magnificat.

Postremo *Oratio* eo prorsus modo quo ad officium matutinum.

Porro *Completerium* hic in totum ommittendum censuimus, et similiter horas illas consuetas *Primam*, *Tertiam*, *Sextam*, et *Nonam*. Tunc quod in his omnibus fiat parum utilis et ociosa rerum semper earundem repetitio, tum et iam quod instar ludibrii videatur, eandem horarum partitionem (fol. 12a) retinere quam olim prisca patres observabant quum mos ille septies in die orandi jampridem in ecclesia exoleverit, soleamusque nunc bis tantum in die ad preces convenire. Et in locum completorii lectiones illas duas vespertinas suffecimus, que semper alie atque alie occurrentes ut utilitatis plus, ita et tedii minus tam lectoribus quam auditoribus afferent.

Nolumus autem quenquam ad aliud pro Officiis matutinis aut vespertinis dicendum quam hic est expressum obligari.

*Canon de abbreviandis² ecclesiasticis precacionibus
propter predicationem
Verbi.*

Nunc vero quoniam hunc scopum in hac ecclesiasti-

¹ Lus MS.

² abbreviendis in MS.

carum precacionum editione potissimum spectamus ut omnia (juxta Pauli consilium) quaecumque in ecclesia geruntur ad edificationem ecclesie fiant, cumque hoc quod tantopere cupimus persuasum habeamus maxime ex eo eventurum si pastores cordati et eruditi serio omnibus modis operam et diligentiam impendant ut verbum Dei quam manifestissime populo indocto subinde exponatur et cessanti¹ quam studiosissime inculcetur, eam ob rem, ne quid publicarum precacionum nostrarum prolixitas hic a nobis instituta operam illam bonorum pastorum in suo grege docendo aut impedire aut ulla ex parte remorari valeat, hoc canone cautum et confirmatum esse volumus uti quotiescumque sermo aliquis exhortationis dicendus est ad plebem aut predicatio habenda, tunc liceat parocho *Te Deum*, et quartam lectionem cum symbolo *Quicumque vult* in publicis illis coram populo precacionibus pretermittere, nimirum ut populus nimis diuturna lectione detentus ac defatigatus aut non satis alacris accedat aut non satis temporis habeat ad audiendam predicationem Evangelii et claram ostensionem spiritus Christi.

Fol. 12b. *Benedictiones dicende ante
lectiones matutinas.*

- Prima. *Adsis o pater omnipotens audique precantes.*
 Secunda. *Nate Deo Deus ipse precantum suscipe vota.*
 Tertia. *Spiritus alme tuis nos largiter imbue donis.*
 Quarta. *Dis trina unius, una trium, Deus adjuvei
unus.*

*Benedictiones dicende ante
lectiones vespertinas.*

- Prima. *Nos pater et gnatus benedicat et halitus
almus.*
 Secunda. *Nos et trina Dei benedicat et una potestas.*
 He benedictiones toti deservient anno.

¹ So MS. (?) *incessanter*.

(fol. 13a.) *Hymni dicendi ad Horas Matutinas
et Vespertinas per totum
fere annum.*

	Ad matutinas in	
	die Dominico,	<i>Primo dierum omnium.</i> ¹
	Ad vespervas,	<i>Christe qui lux es et dies,</i> ²
(fol. 13b.)	Ad matutinas in	
	die Lune,	<i>Immense celi conditor.</i> ³
	Ad vespervas,	<i>Te lucis ante terminum.</i> ⁴
	Ad matutinas in	
	die Martis,	<i>Telluris ingens conditor.</i> ⁵
	Ad vespervas,	<i>Jesu Salvator seculi.</i> ⁶
(fol. 14a.)	Ad matutinas in	
	die Mercurie, ^a	<i>Celi Deus sanctissime.</i> ⁷
	Ad vespervas,	<i>Deus Creator omnium.</i> ⁸

¹ The hymn for matins on sunday in Sarum. "Diebus dominicis ad nocturnum matutinum" (Clichtoveus fol. 6a.)

² In Sarum the hymn for compline from the first Sunday of Lent to Passion Sunday: "In quadragesima ad completorium" (Clichtoveus fol. 25b.)

³ In Sarum the hymn for vespers on monday: "Feria secunda ad vespervas" (Clichtoveus fol. 8b.)

⁴ In Sarum the compline hymn during Advent and from Oct. Epiph. to Lent. "Ad completorium" (Clichtoveus fol. 5b.)

⁵ In S. the hymn at vespers on tuesday: — "Feria tertia ad vespervas" (Clicht. fol. 9b.)

⁶ In S. the compline hymn from the octave of Easter to Ascension. The strophe "*Quaesumus auctor*" is of course omitted here (so too in Clicht. fol. 37b.)

⁷ In S. the hymn at vespers on wednesday. So too Clicht. fol. 10b.

⁸ In S. a compline hymn (Brev. I, 220). "Sabbato ad vespervas" (Clicht. fol. 14a.) The MS. reads "*reos ut*," and "*profunda*" as in Clicht.

^a So MS. The substitution of "a" for "e" is a peculiarity of the scribe in this scheme; thus "marcatus" in the hymn *Christe qui lux*; "parditas" in the hymn *Eterne rex*; in the preface, "dispartivimus"

Ad matutinas in die

Jovis, *Magne Deus potentie.*¹

(fol. 14b.) Ad vespervas, *Lucis Creator optime.*²

Ad matutinas in

die Veneris, *Plasmator hominis Deus.*³

Ad vespervas, *O Pater summæ Deltalis
ortus.*^{a 4}

Ad matutinas in

die Sabbati, *Jam lucis orto sidere.*⁵

(fol. 15a.) Ad vespervas, *O lux beata Trinitas.*⁶

A primis vespervis natalis Domini usque ad secundas vespervas Epiphanie dicentur hii duo hymni, alter ad vespervas, alter ad matutinas:

Ad vespervas, *Christe redemptor om-
nium.*⁷

(fol. 15b.) Ad matutinas, *Agnoscat omne seculum.*⁸

A primis vespervis dominice quinte quadragesime, que vocatur dominica in passione, usque ad dominicam palmarum dicentur hii hymni, alter ad vespervas alter ad matutinas:

¹ In S. and Clicht. hymn at vespers on thursday.

² The hymn at vespers on sunday, S. and Clicht.; but the MS. inverts the order of strophes 2 and 3 and has "*Ne mens*" before "*Qui mane*."

³ The hymn at vespers on friday in S. and Clicht.

⁴ A composition of Clichtoveus (fol. 14b.)

⁵ Hymn for prime in S. and Clicht. (fol. 3b.)

⁶ The hymn at vespers on saturday from the first Sunday after Trinity to Advent in S. "Sabbato ad vespervas" (Clicht. fol. 13b.)

⁷ The hymn of first vespers of Christmas in S. "In nativitate Domini" (Clicht. fol. 17a. who reads "*gentium*" for "*omnium*").

⁸ This hymn is in York but not in Sarum. There can be no doubt however that it was not taken from the York book but from Clicht. ("in nativitate Domini" fol. 17b.). Clichtoveus like the MS. has no doxology.

Ad vesp̄eras, *Cultor dei memento.*¹
 (fol. 16a). Ad matutinas, *Vexilla regis prodeunt.*²

A primis vesp̄eris dominice Palmarum usque ad Pascha dicentur hii duo hymni ad vesp̄eras et ad matutinas:

Ad vesp̄eras, *Magno salutis gaudio.*³
 Ad matutinas, *Hymnum dicamus Domino.*⁴

(fol. 16b). A matutinis in die Pasche usque ad Ascensionem dicentur (hii) hymni ad matutinas et vesp̄eras:

Ad matutinas, *Aurora lucis rutilat.*⁵
 (fol. 17a). Ad vesp̄eras, *Chorus nocte Hierusalem.*⁶

A primis vesp̄eris Ascensionis usque ad Pentecosten dicentur hymni sequentes ad vesp̄eras et ad matutinas:

Ad vesp̄eras, *Festum nunc celebre magnaque gaudia.*⁷
 Ad matutinas, *Eterne rex altissime.*⁸

¹ The compline hymn, Passion Sunday, &c. in Sarum. "In Quadregesima alius hymnus" (Clichtoveus fol. 29a. Clichtoveus and the MS both read "paululum" instead of "paulum" as in Sarum).

² The vesper hymn for Passion Sunday &c. in Sarum. "Dominica in passione" (Clichtoveus fol. 30a.)

³ This hymn is not in the english breviaries or Quignon. "Dominica in ramis palmarum" (Clichtoveus fol. 32a.)

⁴ Not in the english breviaries or Quignon. "De passione Domini" (Clichtoveus fol. 33b.)

⁵ In Clichtoveus fol. 35b "in festis Paschalibus". In Sarum this hymn is divided between matins and lauds of Eastertide from the octave. The strophe "Quaesumus auctor" is not given in the MS.

⁶ Hymn at vesp̄ers of Eastertide from the octave in Sarum. "In tempore Paschali" (Clichtoveus fol. 36b.)

⁷ This hymn is not in the english breviaries or Quignon. It is taken from Clichtoveus "in ascensione Domini" (fol. 38b.)

⁸ In Sarum this hymn is divided between vesp̄ers (or matins) and lauds of Ascension day: The MS. copies the entire hymn as in Clichtoveus ("in ascensione Domini ad completorium" fol. 38b.) reading also in the second line of the doxology, "Qui ascendisti ad ethera", as Clichtoveus, instead of "Qui scandis super sidera" as in Sarum.

(fol. 17b). A primis vesperis Penticostes usque ad primas vespervas dominice Trinitatis inclusive dicentur hii hymni ad vespervas et ad matutinas :

Ad vespervas, *Veni Creator Spiritus*.¹

Ad matutinas, *Jam Christus astra ascend-
erat*.²

(fol. 18b). Orationes per totum annum dicende.

Hec oratio dicetur per totum adventum, *Excita quesumus* &c. as at the fourth Sunday of Advent in App. II.

Hec oratio a primis vesperis natalis Domini usque ad secundas vespervas Epiphanie, *Concede quesumus* &c as at first vespers of Christmas in App. II.

Hec oratio dicetur ab Epiphania usque ad Septuagesimam, *Deus qui nos in tantis* &c: as at fourth Sunday after Epiphany in App. II.

A Septuagesima usque ad Quadragesimam *Deus qui conspicis quia ex nulla etc.* (See Sexagesima collect in S.; but for "*doctoris gentium protectione*" the MS. has "*tua protectione*".)

A prima dominica Quadragesime usque ad Passionem *Deus qui conspicis* &c. as at second Sunday of Lent in App. II; but the first "et" is omitted.

A dominica Passionis ad Pascha, *Omnipotens sempiternus Deus qui humano generi* &c, as at lauds of Passion Sunday in App. II; but "habere valeamus consortia."

(fol. 19a). In die Pasche et (per) totam ebdomadam

¹ In Sarum the hymn at tierce on Whitsunday; "in die Pentecostes" (Clichtoveus f. 40a.)

² In Sarum this hymn is divided between vespers (or matins) and lauds of Whitsunday.

The MS copies the entire hymn as in Clichtoveus (fol. 41a, taking his reading; "compleat" and "omnibus" for "complevit" and "omnium" as in Sarum.

Deus qui hodierna die, as at lauds of Easter Day in App. II.

A prima Dominica post Pascha ad Ascensionem, *Deus a quo bona cuncta* &c. as at fifth Sunday after Easter in App. II.

Ab Ascensione ad Pentecosten, *Concede* &c. as at first vespers of the Ascension in App. II.

In die Pentecostes et per totam ebdomadam, *Deus qui hodierna die corda* etc. "Sancta" is omitted (see, Appendix II, first vespers of Pentecost).

In festo Trinitatis *Omnipotens sempiternus* &c. as at Trinity Sunday in App. II; but "ut ejusdem fidei" instead of "ut in" etc.

Then follow the prayers from the first to the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity as in the breviary scheme (App. II) with the following variants:

Ninth Sunday "propitius" is omitted.

Fourteenth Sunday "ut valeamus assequi."

Twenty-fourth Sunday "a peccatorum nexibus."

(fol. 22a). Sequuntur quarte lectiones prout festa quibus quartas lectiones duximus assignandas in ordine mensium emergent.

(The *Festivale* then follows to fol. 132 inclusive).

APPENDIX IV.

(a) THE LECTIONARIES.

FOUR schemes for the reading of Holy Scripture have to be considered here. The first is the original plan in Cranmer's hand (ff. 151—6); the second the intermediate scheme (ff. 157—9); a third at the beginning of the MS. (ff. 4—6); and the fourth, that printed in the Book of Common Prayer in 1549. They are here distinguished by the numbers (1), (2), (3), and (4).

In regard to the number of lessons to be said at each service the following table shows the stages by which the ancient arrangement was abandoned, and how the plan eventually adopted was arrived at.

OFFICES	NUMBER OF LESSONS.			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Matins	3	3	3	2
Lauds	1			
Vespers	1	1	2	2

Authority for three lessons at matins was to be found in the ancient breviaries, whilst the lesson at

lauds and vespers may be taken as merely an extension of the little chapters at these hours. After the first scheme lauds are left out; but a single lesson is still retained at vespers in the second plan; this was increased to two chapters in the third; an increase which in the printed book was compensated for by reducing the traditional three lessons for matins to two.

It would occupy much space, without corresponding utility, to print in a tabular form these four schemes for a lectionary. The interest of the comparison really lies in the proof afforded of the gradual tendency to substitute the civil for the ecclesiastical year; and, for an arrangement which in some measure corresponded with the ecclesiastical seasons, a mechanical *lectio continua* of the Scriptures.

Thus scheme (1) places the beginning of Genesis at Septuagesima Sunday; in (2) it is transferred to the beginning of January, and this is kept in the Book of 1549. Similarly St. Matthew in (1) also began at Septuagesima, and, although this is not the traditional custom, it at least shows an imitation of the ancient arrangement. In (2) the beginning of this gospel is placed upon March 20th, whilst in (3) and the printed book it is transferred to the beginning of January. St. John's gospel seems from early times to have been associated with Easter tide. In scheme (1) it is begun on Easter Monday; in (2) on January 4th, and in (3) and the printed Book it is begun on March 14th, July 13th and November 9th; that is to say it follows in ordinary course the reading of the gospels adopted in the final scheme.

According to the ancient system the historical books of Scripture were commenced soon after Pentecost. In scheme (1) the beginning is fixed for the 3rd Sunday, in (2) it is placed on June 25th, which represents about the same period of the calendar

year; in the printed Book they begin on April 8th.

In the first scheme a chapter is generally divided into 2, or more commonly 3 lessons. This is gradually abandoned for the system of a chapter for each lesson as it appears in the printed lectionary.

In (1) no lessons are assigned to the matins of Ash Wednesday, to the matins and vespers from Passion Sunday to Easter Sunday inclusively, to the vespers of Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Easter week, and to matins and vespers of Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity and Corpus Christi. These are all provided for by special lessons in the projected breviary. It has been already stated that in (1) Cranmer follows Quignon's arrangement of the ecclesiastical year.

The amount of each book of Holy Scripture assigned to be read remains on the whole much the same throughout the four schemes, but the tendency is to simplification. There are also some interesting variations of which the following may be given as examples.

BOOKS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Chapters.			
Genesis. . .	1—9	1—9		1—9
	11—35		1—50	
	37—50	11—50		11—50
Exodus. . .	1—24	1—24	1—40	1—24
	32—35	32—34		32—35
	40	40		40
Leviticus . .	18, 19, 20.	18, 19, 20.	1—27	18, 19, 20.
Numbers . .	10—25	10—36	1—36	10—36
	27—36			
Josue . . .	1—12	1—12	1—24	1—24
	20	20—24		
	22—24			

BOOKS.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Chapters.			
Hester . . .	1—16	1—16	1—16	1—9
Job . . .	1—42	1—4	1—42	1—42
Matthew . .	4—25	4—25	1—28	1—28
John . . .	1—10	1—10	1—21	1—21
Luke. . .	1, 3—21	1—21	1—24	1—24
Acts. . .	3—5	3—5		
	8—28	8—28	1—28	1—28
Ecclesiasticus.	1—51	1—15	1—51	1—51
		17—51		
Ezekiel . .		2, 3, 8, 9.		2, 3, 6, 7.
		12—22	1—48	
		25—26		13, 14, 18.
		28—37		33—34
Apocalypse .		1—12	1—22	

The third scheme alone provided for the reading of Chronicles I and II, Esdras III and IV, the Canticles and Machabees I and II. The Lamentations of Jeremias, not in (1) and (2), first appear in (3) and are also included in the lectionary of the Book of 1549.

(b) THE CALENDARS.

The following print shews the two calendars of Saints' days contained in the MS. with the contents of the Festivale, or lives of saints, to be read as a lesson on their feast day. The earlier calendar is printed in the first column, the later in the second. It is to be noted that

(1) all the entries in the earlier calendar (ff. 157—9) are in red ink;

(2) those in the later calendar (ff. 4—6) in red are here printed in italics;

(3) all entries in capitals are additions or corrections in Cranmer's hand;

(4) the erasures are specified in the notes;

(5) the entries to which an asterisk is prefixed have a proper lesson in the *Festivalc*, and those marked with a † have a place assigned in the *Festivalc*, but no lesson has been written.

FIRST CALENDAR,	—	SECOND CALENDAR.
Januar.		
1. Circumcisio do- mini.		* <i>Circumcisio.</i>
2.		*Abel.
3.		Noe.
4. Titus.		*Titus.
6. Epiphania domi- ni.		* <i>Epiphania.</i>
7.		Abraham.
8.		LUCIANUS PRESBITER. ¹
9.		Sara.
13. Hilarius.		*Hilarius. ²
14.		Isaac. FELIX NOL. ³
15.		Jacob.
17.		ANTONIUS.
19.		Joseph.
20.		FABIANUS ET SEBAS.
21.		(AGNES).
22. Timotheus.		*Timotheus. VINCEN.
24. Babilas.		
25. Convers. Pauli.		*Conversio Pauli. ⁴
26.		*Ananias.
27. Chrysostomus.		*Chrisostomus.

¹ At fol. 26a after the special lesson for Epiphany is this note in Cranmer's hand, "De Luciano lege eccle. hist. li. 8. ca. 14 et breviarium Romanum".

² At the end of the lesson for St. Hilary Cranmer notes "lege breviarium Romanum" (fol. 27. a.)

³ Fol. 27b, in Cranmer's hand, "De Felice, lege Augustinum, Ambrosium, portiforium, Paulinum in fine Encomenii nuper translati". The precise volume referred to here by Cranmer has not been identified.

⁴ An entry "Babilas" at 24 January has been erased, and Cranmer substituted "Conversio pauli", erasing the entry of that feast at the 25th. Finally Cranmer erased his own entry at the 24th, and wrote "stet" against the erased entry of the 25th.

FIRST CALENDAR.

SECOND CALENDAR.

Februar.

1. Ignatius.
2. Purificatio beate Marie.
3. Philias et Philoromus.
- 4.
- 7.
- 9.
- 10.
- 12.
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.
21. Benjamin.
24. d. Mathias.

*Ignatius.
 *Purificatio Mar.

*PHILEAS ET PHILOROMUS.¹
 ADAUCTUS CUM SOTHS.
 APOLLONIA.
 Vidua paupercula.
 EULALIA.
 Zacharias et Elisabeth.
 JULITA.
 Symion.
 *Benjamin.
 *Mathias.

Martius.

- 3.
4. 40 martyres.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
12. Gregorius.
- 14.
- 18.
- 19.
- 20.
- 24.
25. Annunciatio beate Mar.

MARINUS ET ASTERIUS.
 PERPETUA ET FELICITAS.
 Zacheus.
 *40 MARTYRES.²
 Fidelis latro. GREG.
 Phinees.
 †Edwardus rex et mart.
 †Joseph.
 CUTHBERTUS.
 Hieremias.
 Annunciatio m.

¹ "Phileas and Philoromus" were entered by the scribe at 3 February; this entry has been erased and the feast is inserted by Cranmer at the next day.

² "40 martyres" originally entered by the scribe at 4 March; erased and transferred by Cranmer to the 9th.

FIRST CALENDAR.	—	SECOND CALENDAR.
Aprilis.		
1.		†Joseph ab Arama. ¹
2.		
4. d. Ambrosius.		*Ambrosius.
7.		EPIPHANIUS.
8.		Josue.
11.		LEO I.
13.		JUSTINUS.
14. Tyburtius Valeria- nus etc.		TIBURTIUS ET VALER.
16.		CASSIANUS.
19.		Lidia.
22.		Delbora. ²
23.		†Georgius.
24. d. Marcus.		Gedeon.
25.		*Marcus.
28.		Sanson. VITALIS.
Maius.		
1. Philip. et Jacob.		*Philippi et Jacobi.
2. Athanasius.		†Athanasius.
3.		Booz. INVENTIO CRUCIS.
4.		*Anna uxor helca.
5.		Samuel.
8.		†Centurio.
9. Gregorius Nazian- zenus.		†Gregorius Nazianz.
10.		GORDIANUS ET EPIMA.
13.		David rex. ³
16.		†Chananea. ⁴
26.		†Nathan. AUGUST.

¹ Cranmer has entered at 2 April "Visitatio Marię"; this entry was afterwards crossed through. See 2 July, below. ² So MS.

³ Cranmer enters after David "Cornelius"; this was afterwards crossed through. ⁴ After the *Chananea* the Festivale gives ff. 62—66 a long account of Gordius mart. "ex Basilio".

FIRST CALENDAR.

— SECOND CALENDAR.

Junius.	
1.	PAMPHILUS MARTYR CUM SOTIIS. ¹
2.	MARCELLINUS ET PE- TRUS.
4.	Amorrhousa.
11. Barnabas.	*Barnabas.
13.	†Helyas.
14. Basilius.	*Basilius.
16.	†Anna prophetissa.
18.	†Heliseus.
19.	GERVASIUS ET PROTHAS.
21.	†Baruc.
22.	ALBANUS.
24. Nat. Joan. baptis- ste.	* <i>Nativitas Johannis.</i>
26.	†Ezechias. JOHANNES ET PAULUS.
27.	†Josias.
28. Ireneus.	†Hyreneus.
29. Petrus et Paulus.	* <i>Petrus et Paulus.</i>
30.	Ezechiel. *COMMEO PAULI.
Julius.	
2. Petrus Dorotheus etc.	VISITATIO MARIE. ²
9. Cyrillus.	†Cyrillus.
10.	7 FRATRES MARTYRES.
13.	†Nathanael.

¹ Cranmer had originally entered at 1 June "Justinus martyr"; this is erased and he has substituted Pamphilus as above. Justin martyr is entered at 13 April.

² The original entry by the scribe was "Petrus Dorotheus etc." This has been erased and "Visitatio Marię" originally entered by Cranmer at 2 April is transferred hither.

FIRST CALENDAR.	—	SECOND CALENDAR.
Julius.		
16.		Samaritana.
20.		1
22. Maria Magdalena.		* <i>Maria Magda.</i>
25.		* <i>Jacobi Apostoli.</i>
26. d. Anna.		†Anna.
27.		7 FRATRES DORMIENTES.
29.		†Martha.
Augustus.		
2.		†Esdras.
6.		TRANSFIGURATIO.
8.		†Gamaliel. CYRIACUS.
10. d. Laurencius.		†Laurentius.
13.		†Cornelius. HIPPOLITUS.
15. Assump. b. Marie.		† <i>Assumptio M.</i>
21.		†Appollo et Aquila.
24. d. Bartholomeus.		* <i>Bartholomeus.</i>
27.		†Tobias.
28. d. Augustinus.		*Augustinus D.
30.		FELIX ET ADAUCTUS. ²
September.		
1.		MAMAS.
3.		†Judith.
8. Nativitas b. Marie.		† <i>Nativitas M.</i>
10.		†Daniel.
11.		†Hester. PROTHUS ET HYACINTHUS.
14. Cyprianus.		*Cyprianus ET CORNELIUS.

¹ "Margareta" is entered by Cranmer at 20 July, and afterwards crossed through.

² The entry "Felix et Adauctus" was originally made by Cranmer at 31 August, and afterwards crossed through.

FIRST CALENDAR.	—	SECOND CALENDAR.
September.		
19.		†Job.
21. d. Matheus.		<i>Mathei postoli.</i>
22.		MAURITIUS CUM SO.
23.		TECLA.
24. Tecla.		
27.		COSMAS ET DAMIA.
29. d. Michael.		† <i>Michael cum omnibus A.</i>
30.		†Susanna. HIERO.
October		
4.		†Osee.
6. Polycarpus.		¹
7.		MARCUS ET MARCELL.
9. Dionisius Rusticus etc.		DIONISIUS CUM SO.
11.		* <i>Luce Evangelist.</i> ²
18. d. Lucas.		†Amos.
21.		* <i>Symonis et Judae.</i>
28. d. Simon et Judas.		†Abdias.
30.		†Jonas.
31.		
November.		
1. Omnes Sancti.		* <i>Omnes s. defuncti.</i> ³
2.		MEMORIA ANIMARUM.
4.		†Micheas. VITALIS ET AGRI- CO.
8.		4 CORONATORUM.
9.		THEODORUS.

¹ Polycarpus is entered by the scribe at 6 October; the entry was afterwards erased. Polycarp has a lesson in the *Festivale*.

² Nicasius is entered by Cranmer at 11 October; the entry is erased.

³ Over this entry Cranmer has written: "sancti". The lesson in the *Festivale* for this feast is 1 Thess. IV : 12—17. "Nolo vos ignorare fratres de iis qui obdormierunt . . , to . . sermonibus his . ." (fol. 116b) This is the epistle of the mass at the burial of the dead.

FIRST CALENDAR.	—	SECOND CALENDAR.
November.		
11. d. Martinus.	†	Martinus.
13. Bricius.		BRICIUS.
14.	†	Abacuc.
17.	†	Sophonias.
20.	†	Edmundus rex.
22. Cecilia.	†	Zacharias. CECILI.
23.		CLEMENS.
24.		CHRISOGONUS.
25. Katherina.		CATHERINA.
26.		¹
29.		.SATURNINUS ET SISYN.
30. d. Andreas.	†	Andreas.
December.		
4. Barbara.		
6. Nicolaus.	†	Nicolai.
8.		²
13. Lucie.		LUCIA.
18.	†	Lazarus.
21. Thomas apostolus.	†	Thome apostoli.
25. Natalis domini.	*	Nativitas domini.
26. d. Stephanus.	*	Stephani.
27. d. Joannes Evang.	*	Johannis.
28. Innocentes.	*	Innocentes.

¹ Cranmer has entered at 26 November "Linus",—afterwards crossed through.

² "Conceptio M." was entered by the scribe at 8 Dec.; this has been crossed through. The *Festivale* gives a place for a lesson for the feast.

APPENDIX V.

THE DEBATE ON THE SACRAMENT.

The report of the discussion in parliament which lasted from December 14th to December 18th 1548 forms the Royal MS. 17 B. XXXIX. It comprises 31 leaves in quarto and is bound up with MSS. 17 B. XXXVIII and 17 B. XL.

It has already been pointed out that Cranmer had a copy of the acts of this discussion which he proposed to send to Peter Martyr. It does not appear whether the MS. now described was Cranmer's copy and found its way into the Royal collection through Lord Lumley, or whether, like many other tracts, it was placed in the Royal library at the time. However this may be, there can be no doubt as to the authentic nature of the report and its general fairness. It is true that in some parts the account of what was said by the bishops on the Catholic side, especially on the fourth day, is so much abridged that the sequence of the remarks is occasionally lost. But this may be easily explained in an account of a running discussion. On the other hand the character of the various disputants is so clearly evidenced by

the report that the document affords unmistakable intrinsic proof of its accuracy.

It appears to be drawn up partly from written papers, partly from notes taken during the progress of the debate. It will be noticed that in the account of the opening speech of each bishop the arguments are developed with care in regular sequence, whilst this is not the case in the discussion proper. Moreover there is at least one proof that the reporter misread a MS. before him. Bishop Rugg of Norwich quotes (fol. S b.) from the mass of St. James and St. Clement.¹ The only source available for these quotations at the time was Bessarion's treatise. In the margin however of the MS. the reference is given as "S Bede".

It is evident that the word before the writer was "Bessa": and being unfamiliar with the literature, he read it "Beda".

It may hence be fairly concluded that so far as the set speeches are concerned each speaker probably supplied the reporter with his notes.

The passages quoted from the Fathers are mostly common places in the controversial books of the time. In the report they appear often rather as indications than actual quotations and thus their bearing in the discussion is not always obvious. The passages have accordingly been given in the notes as far as possible.

¹ Notwithstanding the marginal entry "S. Clement", the passage in the text (fol. 9a) is Bessarion's translation from the liturgy of St. Chrysostom (see the tractate *de Sacramento Eucharistiae* in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* CLXI. 500-501). Perhaps the bishop quoted the four litanies as in Bessarion.

MS. REG. 17 B. XXXIX.

Fol. 1a. *CERTAIN NOTES TOUCHING THE DISPUTATIONS OF THE BISHOPS IN THIS LAST PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

SATURDAY THE FIRST DAY.

DOMINUS PROTECTOR.

Commanded the Bishops to the intent to fall to some point to agree what things should first be treated of. And, because it seemed most necessary to the purpose, willed them to dispute whether bread be in the Sacrament after the consecration or not.

DUNELMENSIS.

The mass used to be called so.

And treated awhile thereof, till my lord's grace put him in remembrance of the order taken, which was only to talk of the consecration.

Fol. 1b. But afterward he proceeded saying: The adoration is left out of the book because there is nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine; yet he believed that there is the very body and blood of Christ both spiritual and carnal.

Thus he said to maintain the allegation which he made the night before: That Christ had two bodies, and brought Cyrillus for his author, with a long process saying:

The Spiritual thus he proved: All we shall be such after the resurrection.

PROBATIO
CYRILLUS.
CA. 26. 4. LIB.
SUPER: CARO
MEA. &C.

The Carnal thus: The flesh alone can profit nothing but with the Holy Ghost it quickeneth as: — *Verba quae ego loquor spiritus sunt et vita.*

*Spiritum appellat carnem.*¹

CANTOR.

Touching the spiritual and corporal body of Christ.

When Christ came on the water his disciples took it to be *Phantasma*.

Cyrrillus concerning the death only of the flesh and the power of the divinity spake it.

WIGORNIENSIS.

Fol. 2a.

I think my Lord of Durham doth mean thus: *Caro* by the joining of the word is *Spiritus* i. e. *Caro verbi*.

CANTOR.

The spirit and the body are contrary. It is the error of Origen to believe that at the day of judgment we should be all spirits.

¹ "Quas ob res caro quidem ceterorum omnium quicquam vere non prodest: caro autem Christi quia in ipsa unigenitus Dei filius habitat, sola vivificare potest. Spiritum vero seipsum appellat: quoniam Deus Spiritus est et ut ait Paulus, Dominus spiritus est. Nec ista dicimus quia Spiritum Sanctum in propria persona subsistere non putemus, sed quia sicut factus homo filium se hominis appellat sic se a proprio spiritu spiritum nominat. Non est enim alienus ab eo spiritus suus. *Verba quae ego locutus sum vobis spiritus et vita sunt.* Totum corpus suum vivifica spiritus virtute plenum esse ostendit. Spiritum enim hic ipsam carnem nuncupavit, non quia naturam carnis amiserit et in Spiritum mutata sit, sed quia summe cum eo conjuncta totam vivificandi vim hausit." (S. Cyrillus. *In Evang. Joan.* (ed. 1508 f. 99d.) lib. IV. c. 24 (ed. Aubert VI. 376—7).

WIGORNIENSIS.

CYRILLUS. We eat flesh that giveth life. If we eat man without God it is not profitable.

DURISME.

Spiritus non habet ossa.

OBJECTIO. He meaneth that spirits are only but fancies, and have no bodies nor bones.

SMYTHE.

Of the corporal and spiritual body.

Fol. 2b. A long process declaring what inconvenience, and how loathsome thing to hear, should arise, by description of the natural body in the sacrament. For other Christ must have but a small body, or else his length and thickness¹ cannot be there, which things declare that it cannot be no true body, or else he must want his head or his legs or some part of him.

And also every part of him must be one as big as another, the hand as much as the head, the nose as much as the whole body, with such innumerable.

WIGORNIENSIS.

Reason will not serve in matters of faith.
Hoc est corpus meum.

PROBATIO. It is the body that was offered for us:
Quod pro vobis tradetur.
Ergo. It is real.

CANTOR.

By Scripture our Saviour Christ is our head,

¹ "Thinks" in MS.

and we his body. The word is in our hearing,
in our eyes the Sacrament.

JOHN. 6. *Qui manducat carnem meam* etc.

Fol. 3a. They be two things, to eat the Sacrament
and to eat the body of Christ.

The eating of the body is to dwell in Christ,
and this may be though a man never taste
the Sacrament. All men eat not the body
in the Sacrament. *Hoc est corpus meum.*
He that maketh a will bequeaths certain
legacies, and this is our legacy, remission of
sins, which those only receive that are
members of his body.

And the Sacrament is the remembrance of
this death which made the will good.

CORIN II. *Indigni iudicium sibi manducant.*

They eat not the body of Christ but eat
their condemnation, for he hath nothing to
do with them that are not parcels of his
body. They are not fed of him because they
dwell not in him.

Fol. 3b. It was ordained to be eaten of them that
have¹ everlasting life.

But they say the very body is there when
it is hanged up, which is not found in the
Scripture.

It is also comfortless while it is his body,
for, as soon as you tear the bread with
your teeth (they say) the body flies to heaven,
for it may suffer no such wrong. And while
it is in the bread we have no comfort:
(some other say) the body tarrieth in the
bread till it come to the stomach, and then

¹ "Thave" in MS.

ascends to heaven, for it may suffer no wrong of digestion.

The body that the just receive continueth whole still.

Our faith is not to believe him to be in bread and wine, but that he is in heaven; this is proved by Scripture and Doctors, till the Bishop of Rome's¹ usurped power came in.

Then² no man drinketh Christ or eateth him, except he dwell in Christ and Christ in him.

Fol. 4a.

DUNELMENSIS.

His body is in bread and wine, because God hath spoken it, which is able to do it, saying: This is my body, and This is my blood.

CANTOR.

JOHN. 6.

If the evil man eat his body he hath life everlasting: *Qui edit me habet vitam eternam.*

The bread that we break is his body even as the cup is his blood.

DUNELM.

Hoc quod do est corpus.

As able is he to make it his body as when he said *Fiat lux.*

The evil man receives a good thing evil. But Christ is there, in the bread. I know it by his word.

¹ "Tyme", erased in MS.

² "Than" in MS.

CANTOR.

JOHN 6. *Qui manducat etc.*
If an evil man then¹ eat the bread an
evil man must live ever.

BATHENSIS

ORIGEN. *Panem quem dedit edi, non reservavi in*
Fol. 4b. *crastinum etc.*²
AUGUSTINUS. *Non dubitavit Christus dicere etc.*³
*Dedit discipulis figuram corporis.*⁴
Fecit corpus suum, id est figuram cor-
poris sui.
Sacramentum est cum aliud videtur aliud
*intelligitur.*⁵

WIGORN. *contra* CANTOR.

Granteth that a man may receive the body

¹ "Than" in MS.

² "Nam et Dominus panem, quem discipulis dabat, et dicebat eis, "accipite et manducate," non distulit, nec servari jussit in crastinum". (Orig. *Hom. V. in Levit. ii. 211*).

³ "Nam ex eo quod scriptum est sanguinem pecoris animam ejus esse, praeter id quod supra dixi, non ad me pertinere quid agatur de pecoris anima, possum etiam interpretari praeceptum illud, in signo esse positum; non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, "Hoc est corpus meum", cum signum daret corporis sui". (S. Aug. *Contra Adimant.* cap. 12. sect. 3. ed. Migne VIII. 144) cf. Ridley's *Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper* (Parker Soc. pp. 41-2.) for the argument drawn by the innovating party from this text.

⁴ "Cum adhibuit ad convivium in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit et tradidit" (S. Aug. in *Ps. III.* ed. Bened: IV col. 7).

⁵ "Quomodo est panis corpus ejus? et Calix vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus? Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur Sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualem." (S. Aug. *Sermo* 272. ed. Migne V. 1247.)

without the Sacrament; but he that receiveth it evil receiveth it to his own¹ damnation.

I COR. 10. *Quapropter probet se. etc.*

LINCOLN.

Whether the body is in the Sacrament or in the receiver.

That all men should be judged by Scripture.

Christ gave no example of reserving because he gave it straight.

And the Apostles eat and drank before Christ consecrated.

CICISTRENSIS.

Fol. 5a. It is to be believed and not to be reasoned.
Nisi credideritis non intelligetis. The verity of Christ's body therefore is in the Sacrament.

WESTMONAST.

Advised the audience to understand that the book which was read touching the doctrine of the Supper was not agreed on among the Bishops, but only in disputation; lest the people should think dishonesty in them to stand in argument against their own deed that they hands unto.²

And for his part did never allow the doctrine.

COMES WARWICE.

That it was a perilous word spoken in that audience; and thought him worthy of displeasure, that, in such a time when concord is sought for, would cast such occasions of discord among men.

¹ "awne." in MS.

² So MS.; *read* "they (had set their) hands unto."

Fol. 5b. MONDAY, THE SECOND DAY.

DOMINUS PROTECTOR *contra*

WESTMONAST.

First of the words that were spoken by him on Saturday at night before.

The Bishops' consultation was appointed for unity.

The book of their agreements was read.

In "Councells" though some consent not unto the thing, yet by the most part it is concluded.

Only the Bishop of Chichester refused to agree, 1. For that in Confirmation there was left out oil on the foreheads. 2. And also in the prayer of the Communion where it is written, *That it may be unto us etc.* he would have *Be made unto us.* 3. Also to have certain words added after the consecration which were: *That these Sacrifices and oblations, etc.*

Fol. 6a. WESTMONAST.

RESPON. The considerations moving him to the subscription of the book.

1. First, although of some there is in it too much, yet they confess it to be standing with Scripture.
2. Though many things want in the book, yet they are agreed to be treated on afterwards; wherein he desireth to agree with other Churches.

3. He considered the unity at home in this Realm.

4. Also we condemn not them that use ceremonies for we yet use some.

These are the two great sticks :

The elevation, wherein is considered the doing of it and the end wherefore it is done. The necessity of it and end is this, to remember Christ upon the Cross.

FOL. 6b.

PROBATIO.

PSAL. 98.

EXPOSITIO.

AUGUSTINUS.

The adoration : wheresoever the Sacrament is, to be worshipped ; as

Adorate scabellum pedum.

Terra est scabellum.

*Caro significat terram.*¹

Other things in consideration of the unity at home might be altered, but the adoration to be left out he never consented, nor to the doctrine agreed.

And because (of) the diversity of opinions for the verity of the body and blood, he desired to have it spoken plainly in the Sacrament because of the doubtful understanding of the Region.

Also there was in the book : Oblation, which is left out now.

Things in disputation are not agreed upon till we allow that which is spoken of.

¹ "Fluctuans converto me ad Christum, quia ipsum quero hic et invenio quomodo sine impietate adoretur terra, et sine impietate adoretur scabellum pedum ejus. Suscepit enim de terra terram; quia caro de terra est et de carne Mariæ carnem accepit. Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulavit et ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit (nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit) inventum est quemadmodum adoretur tale scabellum pedum Domini et non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando."

(S. Aug. *Enar. in Ps. 98. (9.)*)

The plainness of the truth in God's¹ Word is to be set forth, the want whereof caused him in his conscience not to agree to the doctrine.

SMYTHE.

Fol. 7a. The verity of the body and blood in the Sacrament my Lord of Westminster is persuaded unto. Yet touching this book, of the doctrine all they are agreed so far as is of me read.

DOMINUS PROTECTOR.

These vehement sayings sheweth rather a wilfulness and an obstinacy to say he will die in it. To say he will prove it by old doctors, and thereby would persuade men to believe his sayings, when he bringeth no authority in deed.

LONDON.

When anything is called into question, if ye dispute it, ye must see whether it be decent, lawful and expedient.

This doctrine is not decent because it hath been condemned abroad as an heresy; and in this Realm; example of Lambert.

Fol. 7b. We have agreed before of the verity in the Sacrament; and to go against the same, we should seem like Agabus that could speak with one mouth, truth and falsehood.² Lies and true things.

The faults in the book are these:

¹ "goods" in MS.

² "Falshed" in MS.

There is heresy because it is called bread.

Chrysostom says there are three breads :
 Corporal, wherewith the Apostles were fed ;
 two of them the Son of Man, as

Ego sum panis, in sacramento.

But

JOHN. 6.

Panis quem ego dabo &c.

If he kept promise with them he gave
 them both bread and flesh.

DOMINUS PROTECTOR.

MATT.

He took bread, &c.

MARK.

Take, eat, this is my body.

LUKE.

Who can take this otherwise but there
 is bread still ?

2 CORIN.

And Paul sayeth so calling it bread :

Fol. 8a.

*As oft as ye eat of this bread and drink
 of this cup, &c. He took bread and blessed
 it and gave it to his disciples.* Here doth
 appear plainly that which he blessed he
 gave to his disciples ; and that is bread.

LICHEFELD.

Thought the doctrine of the book very
 godly.

For he never thought it to be the gross
 body of Christ, so grossly as divers there
 alleged ; nevertheless he took it to be the
 glorified body of Christ.

NORWICHE.

Three things are treated upon :

1. The Real presence ;
2. Whether the body be received of an evil
 man, or not.
3. Of *transubstantiation*, and whether the bread

Fol. 8b. be the very substance of the body, or not.
Scripture is called the Sword of the Spirit.
The sword is unity and concord.

It is not Scripture but the devil that moves dissensions.

Our holy fathers consented together in unity.

They say that in the Supper Christ confesseth he gave his body saying: *that shall be given for you.*

His body was a true body, which they say he gave to his disciples; a very body.

It is a true body, and a spiritual body beside.

St. Paul sheweth that we receive the very body when we take the bread, saying:

I. CORIN. 10. *Panis quem frangimus &c.*

This form used St. James in his Mass:

S. BEDE. *Rogamus ut Spiritus sanctus adveniens*
FOL. 9a. *sanctificet hunc panem, et faciat verum*
corpus filii sui Christi.

S. CLEMENT. *Emitte spiritum tuum super haec sacrificia,*
*ut panem hunc in Corpus Christi transmutas ea Spiritu Sancto.*¹

Chrysostome manifestly doth declare that it is the very body of Christ real. *Si carnem et sanguinem speciem reservans, &c.*²

THEOPHIL. *Consonans in Ecclesia &c.*
ALEXAND.

DAMASCE. *Quemadmodum in Baptismate &c.*³

¹ So MS. see Bessarion, Patr. Graec CLXI, 501 (S. Chrysost.)

² See much on this passage, often used in the controversies of the time, in the Answer of Cranmer to Gardiner (Parker Soc. ed. pp. 188—192). It is quoted as Theophilus of Alexandria by Fisher *De Veritate corporis* (ed. 1527 f. 153) from which the Bishop of Norwich, as subsequently Gardiner, probably quoted it.

³ "Quemadmodum in baptismate (quia consuetudo hominibus est

Christ took not his Godhead from heaven when he descended, nor his body from the earth likewise when he ascended.

It is not in Scripture: "Lord, whither goest thou?" *Respon.* "I go to Rome to be crucified again." This was said to Peter.

*Panis fit caro per spiritum sanctum quemadmodum in deipara assumpsit carnem &c.*¹

DAMASCE.

Non est figura Corporis, sed ipsum Corpus, ipso Domino dicente: Hoc est meum, non figura corporis.

Fol. 9b.

*Qui manducat me vivit in eternum.*²

LINCOLN. *contra* NORWICH.

These are the three points:

1. The real presence in the Sacrament.
2. Whether evil men receive that body, or no.
3. The transubstantiation.

OBJECTIO.

We must rest on faith, not on reason.

aqua lavari et oleo ungi) conjunxit oleo et aquæ gratiam Spiritus Sancti et fecit illud lavacrum regenerationis. Hunc in modum, quia mos hominibus est panem manducare et vinum et aquam bibere, conjunxit his ipsis suam divinitatem et fecit hæc suum corpus et sanguinem".

(S. Joan : Damascen. *Orthodoxæ Fidei* IV. c. 14. (ed. 1539, pp. 142—3).

¹ "Corpus enim, secundum veritatem conjunctum est Divinitati, quod ex sancta Virgine corpus est non quod ipsum corpus assumptum ex coelo descenderit sed quod ipse panis et vinum transmutatur in corpus et sanguinem Dei. Si autem modum requiris quonam pacto sit, sat sit tibi audire quoniam per Spiritum Sanctum, quemadmodum ex sancta Deipara seipso, et in seipso Dominus carnem sustenavit. (Ibid.)

² "Non est figura panis et vinum corporis et sanguinis Christi (absit enim hoc) sed est ipsum corpus Domini edificatum, ipso Domino dicente: Hoc est corpus meum, non figura corporis sed corpus, et non figura sanguinis sed sanguis. Et ante hoc ipsis Judeis, quoniam nisi manducaveritis carnem, filii hominis et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam æternam. Caro mea verus est cibus et sanguis meus verus est potus. Et rursus; Qui manducat me, vivet," (Ibid.)

RESPONSIO. Yet faith must have a ground. And that is not of man but of God.

After his consecration is written:

MATT. 26. *Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis.*

MARK. 14. This my blood; he calleth it afterward the

LUKE. 22. fruit of the vine. What is the fruit of this
CHRYSTOSTOM. vine but wine?

THEOPHILAC. *Non bibam ex hoc vino.¹ Vivam² in mysterio
AUGUSTINUS redemptionis nostrae quum dixit, Non bibam
DE ECCLESIAE DOGMAT. &c.³
FOL. 10a.*

1 CORIN. 10. *Unus panis multi sumus;* he calleth it here Bread, speaking of the Sacrament.

Why he left it in bread and wine; because of many is made one, to declare the mystery of our unity.

The form and accidents cannot shew us of this unity.

The flesh and blood alone cannot shew us of this unity.

CYPRIA. DE *Dedit panem et vinum discipulis.* But upon
UNCTIONE the Cross his body to the soldiers to be
CHRISMATIS. crucified.⁴

The mass of James cannot be shewed. As touching the words in the prayer wherewith my Lord of Chichester is offended, they

¹ The passage in Theophylact referred to is: *In Evang. S. Marci.* cap. XIV. (ed. Migne), 1. 651. That in St. Chrysostom is *In Matthaeum.* Homil.: LXXXII ed. Migne VII. 740.

² So MS.

³ "Vinum fuit in redemptionis nostrae mysterio cum dixit: *Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis.*" S. Aug. *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus* cap. XLII (ed. Migne VIII. 1220.)

⁴ "Dedit itaque Dominus noster in mensa, in qua ultimum cum Apostolis participavit convivium propriis manibus panem et vinum: in cruce vero manibus militum corpus tradidit vulnerandum." (Pseudo-Cyprianic treatise *De unctione Chrismatis.* op Basileæ 1530 p. 477.)

stand well by Scripture and are meet and convenient.

Fol. 10b. For we are sure we pray for no less than Christ himself made.

CHRYSO.
HOMELI. 88. *Chrysostom* spoke that to raise up our minds in priesthood; saith not once think we be of the earth. And so meaneth he of the Sacrament, *Quod nos transimus in carnem Christi*. Even thus they speak of us as well as of the Sacrament.

EUSEBIUS. Wilt thou know how thou are turned? Ask thyself that art turned, for no outward thing is changed.¹

The translating of the element must² have another meaning and not be grossly understood.

¹ "Quanta itaque et quam celebranda beneficia vi divinae benedictionis operetur attende; et ut tibi novum et impossibile non debeat videri quod in Christi substantiam terrena mortalia committantur, te ipsum qui jam in Christi es regeneratus interroga: dudum alienus a vita, peregrinus a misericordia, a salutis via intrinsecus mortuus exulabas, subito initiatus Christi legibus et salutaribus mysteriis innovatus, in corpus ecclesiae, non vivendo sed credendo transisti: et de filio perditionis adoptivus Dei filius fieri occulta puritate meruisti. In mensura visibili permanens major factus es teipso invisibiliter, sine quantitatis augmento, cum ipse atque idem esses, multo aliter fidei processibus extitisti. In exteriori nihil additum est et totus in interiori homine mutatus es: ac si homo Christi filius affectus et Christus in hominis mente formatus est. Sicut ergo sine corporali sensu, praeterita vilitate deposita, subito novam indutus es dignitatem: et sicut hoc, quod in te Deus laesa curavit, infecta diluit, maculata detersit, non oculis sed sensibus tuis credis; ita et tu cum ad reverendum altare salutari cibo potuque reficiendus accedis, sacrum Dei tui corpus et sanguinem fide respice, honore mirare, mente continge, cordis manu suscipe et maxime haustu interiore assume". (Eusebius Emisenus Op. ed. 1547 f. 45).

² "Moste" in MS.

LEO. *Virtute celestis cibi transimus in carnem Christi.*¹

Damascen is no worthy author for he joineth the promise to oil as well as to water, which God hath only said of water.

Also he maintaineth idolatry to worship images.

Fol. 11a.

NORWI.

JOHN. 6. *Quid si videritis filium hominis &c.*

MATT. 26. *Pauperes habebitis semper &c.*

After his resurrection he sayeth: *Haec locutus sum vobis etc.* While he was yet among us then. And so is this text of *Quid si* to be taken.

LINCOLN. contra NORWICH.

By Scripture and Chrysostome they would prove transubstantiation, as *Cepit panem. Non fregit panem. Sed Corpus Christi.*

I COR. 10. *Panis quem frangimus &c.*

BEDA. *Fregit panem.*

CHRYSOST. *Vides panem, vides vinum &c.*

Think not that thou receivest the body of Christ at the hands of the priest, *sed tanquam Seraphim*² *ignem.*³

DURHAM contra LINCOLN.

This text *Non bibam &c.* is declared in

¹ The passage referred to is probably: "Non enim aliud agit participatio corporis et sanguinis Christi, quam ut in id quod sumimus transeamus; et in quo commortui et consepulti et conresuscitati sumus, ipsum per omnia et spiritu et carne gestemus". (S. Leo. Mag. *Sermo* LXIII. ed. Migne I. 357).

² "curaphyn." in MS.

³ "Propter quod et accedentes ne putetis vos accipere divinum corpus

Fol. 11b. Luke, Mark, and Matthew; but no man can prove by Scripture that Christ did eat himself.

Panis quem frangimus &c. It is not meant of material bread, by that which followeth *Omnes panis unus sumus*. No natural bread.

LINCOLN.

Christ did eat the Sacrament hisself for Christ saith so.

AUSTEN.

Luke spake there *per anticipationem*. *Panis* is that which is broken. It is *Mysticus* yet it is bread.

De uno pane participamus; is bread.

DUNELMENSIS.

By anticipation Scripture speaketh of Sacraments by the name of that it was before. It was bread before. And it was flesh and he would not go against himself.

Fol. 12a.

LINCOLN.

OBJECTIO. D. It was called wine because it was wine before.

CONFUTATIO. L. Should we then say that Christ is called God because he was God before, but because he is God still.

EXODUS, 7. *Virga versa in colubrum*, truly turned by the senses seen and perceived. We have no text that *Vinum versum est in sanguine*.

ex homine, sed ex ipsis Seraphim forcipe ignem, ut scilicet Isaias vidit, divinum corpus accipere putate." (S. Joan: Chrysos: *De Poenitentia*, Hom. IX. ed. Migne 11. 345.)

nem Christi. Nor our senses perceive it not neither.

JOHAN. 2. The water was turned into wine; verily not water still, but the senses felt it to be altered.

OBJECTIO. D. That it was common bread then.

RESPONS L. Nay it is *mysticus*.

OBJECTIO. D. Because of the omnipotence of God, he hath made bread flesh.

RESP. L. I believe that Christ is true and omnipotent.

ROFFENSIS

PETRUS. Render reason and cause of the faith that is within you.

OBJECTIO. D. Scriptures alleged that after the consecration there remaineth no bread. And that the body is no material bread. *Ergo* there is no bread.

Communicatio is the true mystery and sign of the body that was given for us.

AUGUST. He doubteth not to call his body by the word of the sign of his body.¹

CHRYSOST. *Est figura non tantum figura, &c.*

This same body we receive that Christ gave in his supper.

AUGUST. Calleth it the grace of his body.

ACT. *Et erant perseverantes in fractione panis. Perdurabant unanimiter frangentes panem.*

AUGUST. *Detrahe verbum pani et est panis. Adde verbum et est sanctus et mysticus.*

Touching *conversum* and *transelementatum*.

¹ See the passage quoted *ante*. (note 3 on fol. 4. b.).

CYRILLUS.

It is changed when the child of wrath is made the child of God. And we say true, that Christ is in us naturally, i.e. ¹ the very property of his body is in us, that is to say, *Vita*.

Fol. 13a.

Septima Synodus de adoratione simulacrorum. But in another Council there was brought an image before them and all they worshipped it and ² condemned the former.

As Christ took upon him manhood and remaineth God; so is bread made by the Holy Ghost holy and remaineth bread still. *Panis communionis non est panis simplex sed panis unitus divinitati*. As a burning coal is more than a coal for there is fire with it. *Conjungit pani divinitatem*. He changeth bread *in virtutem carnis; non in veritatem*. *Theophylactus* allegeth so. ³

LICHFELD.

Desireth to speak a gross word, not for transubstantiation for he thought ever that

Fol. 13b. could not be. But for transmutation, and

¹ "That" erased in MS.

² "all" erased in MS.

³ "Non enim figura et exempla quoddam Dominici corporis panis est, sed in illud ipsum convertitur corpus Christi. Dominus enim dicit: Panis quem Ego dabo, caro mea est. Non dixit, Figura est carnis meae, sed, caro mea est. Et iterum; nisi ederitis carnem Filii hominis, Et quomodo? inquit: caro enim non videtur? O homo, propter infirmitatem istud fit. Quia enim panis quidem et vinum ex his quibus assuevimus, ea non abhorremus: sanguinem vero propositum et carnem videntes non ferremus, sed abhorreremus; idcirco misericors Deus nostrae infirmitati condescendens, speciem quidem panis et vini servat, in virtutem autem carnis et sanguinis transelementat." (*Theophylactus in Evang. Marci*, Cap. XIV. ed. Migne I. 650.)

that it is a mystical bread; for the fathers spake oft of that.

WIGORNIENSIS.

This text you say *Hoc est Corpus* &c. doth not take away the substance of bread. And that there is none other substance but bread.

Is it meant then that we receive in faith when we receive the very body.

ROFFENSIS.

RESPON. Concerning the outward thing it is very bread. But according to the power of God is ministered the very body.

WIGORNIENSIS.

QUESTIO. Whether the receiver taketh any substance in the Sacrament or not?

ROFFENSIS.

Fol. 14a. RESPON. The carnal substance sitteth on the right hand of the Father. After this understanding of the presence he is not in the Sacrament. He is absent, for he saith he will leave the world.

And in another sense (he saith) he will be with us until the end of the world.

AUGUST. Expounded thus by St. Austen. He goeth away after a certain sort and is with us still after a certain sort. ¹⁾

¹ "Yet one place more of St. Augustine will I allege, which is very clear to this purpose, that Christ's natural body is in heaven, and not here corporally in the Sacrament. In his 51st Treatise, which he writeth upon John, he teacheth plainly and clearly, how Christ, being both God and man, is both here after a certain manner, and yet in heaven,

The manhood is ever in heaven; his divinity is everywhere present. When he was here he was *circumscriptive* in one place as touching his natural body.

Secundum ineffabilem gratiam. I will be with you till the consummation. Christ sits in heaven. And is present in the Sacrament by his working.

WIGORN.

Fol. 14b. All the old doctors grant a conversion of the bread.

QUESTIO. Wherein is the bread converted? Is it in the bread?

ROFFENSIS.

RESPON. It is converted into the body of Christ

and not here in his natural body and substance which he took of the blessed Virgin Mary, speaking thus of Christ, and saying: "By his divine majesty, by his providence; by his unspeakable and invisible grace, that is fulfilled which he spake, "Behold, I am with you unto the end of the world". But as concerning his flesh which he took in his incarnation; as touching that which was born of the Virgin; as concerning that which was apprehended by the Jews, and crucified upon a tree, and taken down from the cross, wrapped in linen clothes, and buried, and rose again and appeared after his resurrection; as concerning that flesh, he said, "Ye shall not ever have me with you". Why so? For as concerning his flesh, he was conversant with his disciples forty days; and they accompanying, seeing, and not following him, he went up into heaven, and is not here. By the presence of his divine majesty, he did not depart; as concerning the presence of his divine majesty, we have Christ ever with us: but, as concerning the presence of his flesh, he truly said to his disciples: "Ye shall not ever have me with you".

"For as concerning the presence of his flesh, the church had him but a few days: now it holdeth him by faith, though it see him not". (S. August. Tract. 51 in *Joan. Ev.* cap. 12. (ed Migne, Tract. 50, 13). Translated by Bishop Ridley in *A Brief declaration of the Lord's Supper.* Parker Soc. Works" p. 43.

QUESTIO. How are we turned in baptism?

WIGORN.

RESPON. Spiritually.

ROFFENSIS.

Even as glass receiveth the light of the sun, but the stone cannot for it may not pierce through it, so the evil man cannot receive the body.¹

COMES WARWICKE.

Fol. 15a. Where is your Scripture now, my Lord of Worcester? Methinks because you cannot maintain your argument neither by Scripture nor doctors, you would go to now with natural reason and sophistry.

CANTOR.

I believe that Christ is eaten with heart.

The eating with our mouth cannot give us life. For then should a sinner have life. But eating of his body giveth life.

Only good men can eat Christ's body. When the evil eateth the Sacrament, bread and wine, he neither hath Christ's body nor eateth it.

¹ Bishop Ridley at another time used the same argument, "Now you will say, what kind of presence do they grant, and what do they deny? Briefly, they deny the presence of Christ's body in the natural substance of his human and assumed nature, and grant the presence by grace." . . . "by grace . . . the same body of Christ is here present with us. Even as, for example, we say the same sun, which, in substance, never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's word and his sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*, the Sun of righteousness." (Ridley Works. Parker Soc. p. 13.)

JOHN. This body is not in the evil man for it is on the right hand. *No man ascended into heaven. &c.*

The good man hath the word within him, and the godhead by reason of an indissoluble annexion is in the manhood.

Fol. 15b. Eating with his mouth giveth nothing to man, nor the body being in the bread.

IRENEUS, Lib. 3
CAPITE 33⁰
Bread is my
body. Christ gave to his disciples bread and wine, creatures among us, and called it his body saying *Hoc est Corpus meum.*¹

WIGORN.

Ancient writers call it a mystery incomprehensible and *Horrible.*

OBJECTIO.
CANTOR. It is no profit to believe that an evil man receiveth the body.

RESPON.
WIGORN. He said he would give them such bread as was never given before. As touching the naturalness of the bread *Manna* is more divine by seeming. He that believeth in me shall live by me, but he meaneth not bread but his own flesh.

Fol. 16a. ROFFENSIS.

QUESTIO. What bread meant he when he said
JOHN 6. *Ego sum panis.*
Panis quem ego dabo.

WIGORN.

OBJECTIO. The working of it is made by the receiver, yet they all eat one thing.

¹ "Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis.... eum qui ex creatura panis est, accepit et gratias egit dicens: Hoc est meum corpus. Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est." (S. Irenæus. *Contra Hæres*: IV. c. XVII. ed Migne 1023.)

AUGUST,

Cum edunt ipsam carnem.

Judas received *ipsam carnem* but he dwelled not in Christ nor Christ in him.

Example of an old man and a sick. They eat one meat but not alike available.

CANTOR.

Scriptures and doctors prove that *Hic calix* is figurative, which he often used and *significabat vinum*.

WIGORN.

The Scripture is received because the Church hath received it. Likewise the Sacrament.

ELIENSIS.

DE ELEVATIONE.

Fol. 16b.

There is no visible thing that is God. The question to the sick whether he believeth that he seeth the body and blood of Christ when he seeth bread and wine is an error. Images and worshipping of bread have been a let that Jews believe not in Christ because the bible speaketh against idolatry.

TUESDAY. THE THIRD DAY.

CICISTRENSIS.

Hoc est Corpus meum.

The matter concerneth not only the wealth of the body but of souls.

The Sacrament hath been called and taken an article of our faith to believe that the body is there after the consecration.

The people that have been commonly called the Church have thus believed.

And the opinion that we receive not the body that was given for us to death hath been rejected.

Fol. 17a. And to say that we receive the Sacraments but as signs of the body and blood hath been condemned.

Yet both sides, the one and the other, ground their reasons upon Scripture and doctors. In time past the pure words of Christ were taken.

But now we expound them by trope and figure.

Yet there should be brought some Scripture that these words were spoken by figure. Or else they must be taken as they are barely spoken.

If there be a trope then it is requisite to shew in what word it is.

Whether in *Hoc est*, or *Corpus*. But this I wot, we shall be sore assulted of Satan when we go hence to prove whether we ground our doctrine upon Scripture or not.

Fol. 17b. If it be a trope, it is in *Corpus*.

Scripture saith *Corpus* is the same body that shall be broken for us, which was a natural body.

In John his Apostles did eat him and drink him spiritually; but he promised them bread and that they should eat him and drink him otherwise, yet spiritually too.

JOHN. 6. *Panis quem ego dabo pro mundi &c.*

CHRYSOST. in EPISTOLAM I. The word body thus signifieth the very

AD CORIN.

CAP. 10.

To touch a great man's gown with (de)filed hands is not sufferable. Even so to eat the

flesh and drink the blood with corrupt conscience.

It is that body by the which hell was broken and heaven opened, the selfsame body that was wounded with the spear and gushed out blood.¹

Touching *Hoc*.

Material bread cannot be the substance of Christ.

Fol. 18a. Therefore *Hoc* must needs *praedicare Corpus non panem*.

SMYTH.

It is more horrible to eat flesh than to break it. To drink blood than to shed or pour it out.²

And touched my Lord of Chichester's rhetoric.

CICESTRENSIS *contra* SMYTHE.

RESPON. That he uttered not his tale by human reason or by rhetoric, for in that Mr. Smythe is a great deal better than he.

¹ "Si autem humanum vestimentum nemo ausus fuerit temere tangere; quomodo corpus universorum Dei immaculatum et purum, quod cum divina illa natura versatum est per quod sumus et vivimus, per quod portae mortis fractae sunt et fornaces coeli aperti sunt, cum tanta contumelia accipimus?... Hoc corpus clavis confixum, flagris coesum, mors non tulit, hoc corpus sol cum crucifixum videret, radios avertit &c. &c... Hoc corpus dedit nobis et tenendum et comedendum, quod intensae dilectionis fuit." (S. Joannis Chrysost: in Ep: 1. ad Cor. Cap. 10. Hom: XXIV (4) ed. Migne x 203—4).

² This is really a quotation from St. Augustine "Quamvis horribilius videatur humanam carnem manducare quam perimere, et humanum sanguinem potare quam fundere." *Contra adversarium legis* II. cap. IX. ed. Migne VIII 658).

It is said that the doctors maintained not the substance in the Sacrament, and he alleged *Erasmus* for the judgment of the Fathers.

DOMINUS PROTECTOR.

Fol. 18b. To allege *Erasmus* who is but a new writer, and not recite the ancient doctors is inconvenient, since ¹ by Scriptures and old writers it was agreed that these arguments should first be proved.

CICESTRENSIS.

Intendeth not to make *Erasmus* his author, but to shew his mind how he understood a place in Scripture.

DEUTERO.
CAP. 14.

*Non alligabis os bovis trituran-
tis.*

This proveth he to be spoken for the ministers that are living rehearsed by St. Paul saying *Nunquid de bobus curae est Deo*. And these are not contrary and St. Austin holds opinion that children shall not have life except they eat the Sacrament. ²

JOHN. 6.

Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis.

SMYTH.

AUGUST.

Non dubitavit Christus dicere, Hoc est Corpus meum, cum signum corporis sui daret. ³

¹ "Sith" in the MS.

² "Ac per hoc etiam pro parvulorum vita caro data est, quae data est pro saeculi vita; et si non manducaverint carnem Filii hominis, nec ipsi habebunt vitam". (S. Aug. *de Peccat. meritis* ed. Migne X. 124).

³ See the passage already quoted (note 3 on fol. 4. b.).

CYCESTRENSIS.

Fol. 19a. Saint Austin also is not afraid to say he saw Christ's body when he saw the Sacrament.¹

SMYTH.

AUGUST. Blood is a sign of a thing that had life. Christ gave as much as any can consecrate; and then he had not shed his blood.

CYCESTRENSIS.

If a man see a figure or a sign it is not the thing itself, as white and round is not the bread itself. Even so Christ gave the Sacrament that the form and accidents of the bread should remain, but not very bread.

SMYTH.

As who saith, I am a man, but because it is night I cannot be discerned so well.

Fol. 19b. Therefore except ye see me perfectly I am no man. This is false for I am man still and so the Sacrament is bread still. Though these arguments be able to prove inwardly neither this nor that.

LONDON.

There belongs to the Sacrament *Modus dandi* and *Res data*.

Res data non est figura.

¹ "Panis ille quem videtis in altari, sanctificatus per verbum Dei, corpus est Christi. Calix ille, imo quod habet calix, sanctificatum per verbum Dei, sanguis est Christi". (S. Aug. Sermo 227. ed. Migne. V. 1099) cf. also Sermo 272 ibid. 1246.

² cf. S. Aug. ed. Migne III 703.

CANTOR.

AUGUST. Blood is a figure of the life.¹ So is the bread a sign of the body.

OBJECTIO. Whether there be any figured speech in
CYCESTR. *Hoc est Corpus.*

But *this Cup is my blood* must needs be *figuratè*.

These two which nourisheth us Christ calleth his body and blood.

But answer to *Irenaeus* that ancient writer, the disciple of *Polycarpus* which was John's disciple.

CYCESTRENSIS.

Fol. 20a. If *Panis* in *Panis quem frangimus* is to
CORIN. XI. be considered very bread, then must *Corpus* also that followeth in the same text be taken to be the very body.

WIGORN.

We see a thing and there is a thing hid also.

There is both *Signum* and *Corpus*.

CANTOR.

AUGUST. *Quid paras ventrem et dentes? Crede et manducasti.*²

AUGUST. *Carnaliter intelligere est verba ut dicuntur intelligere.*³

¹ Ibid.

² "Hoc est opus Dei, ut credatis in eum quem misit ille. Hoc est ergo manducare cibum non qui perit sed qui permanet in vitam eternam. Utquid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti". (S. Aug: in. Joan: Tract. XXV. c. 12. ed. Migne. III. 1602).

³ The following passage from St. Augustine presents a similar thought.

ELYENSIS.

IRENÆUS. *Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans terrenum et celeste &c.*¹

DUNELMENSIS.

Consenteth that he called bread his body and wine his blood for so doth the gospel.

But he expounded it after a sort and denied after any bread to remain.

Fol. 20b.

LINCOLN.

IRENÆUS. Confessus est Calicem suum sanguinem.²

ROFFENSIS.

Panis in quo gratiae actae sunt quoddam³ terrenum est et supernum.

He blessed not his natural body but *panem*.

And of a phantastical body there is no figure.

"Quoniam quisquis illum diem nunc usque observat sicut littera sonat, carnaliter sapit". (S. Aug. *De Spiritu et Littera*, ed. Migne X. 216).

¹ "Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et coelesti: sic et corpora nostra percipientia Eucharistiam jam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia".

(S. Irenaeus *contra Hæres*: IV c. 18, ed: Bened. 251).

² "Quomodo autem constabit eis, cum panem in quo gratiae actae sint, corpus esse Domini sui, et calicem sanguinis ejus, si non ipsum fabricatoris mundi Filium dicant, id est Verbum ejus, per quod lignum fructificat, defluunt fontes, et terra dat primum quidem fenum, post deinde spicam, deinde plenum triticum in spica. Quomodo autem rursus dicunt carnem in corruptionem devenire et non percipere vitam, quae corpore Domini et sanguine alitur? Ergo aut sententiam mutant, aut abstineant offerendo quae praedicta sunt". (Irenaeus, *Contra Hæres*, IV. c. 18. ed. Bened. 251.)

³ *quondam* in MS. See the passage of St. Irenaeus quoted by Ely.

TERTULLIAN. *Non desinit esse substantia panis.
Nec panem in quo ipse suum corpus
representat &c.*¹

Renatus confesseth that Tertullian was of this opinion and defended it.

CANTOR.

TERTULLIAN. *Appellavit panem suum Corpus.*²

WESTMONAST.

IRENÆUS. *Eucharistiam appellat Corpus, non panem.*³

LINCOLN.

Eucharistia is more than *Panis communis*
1 CORIN. 10. for it is *Mysticus*. As in Paul *Calix benedictionis*.

IRENÆUS. *De pane qui est Corpus eius.*⁴

¹ "Acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, *Hoc est Corpus meum* dicendo id est, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. Cæterum, vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset." (Tertullian. *adv. Marcionem* IV, c. 40. ed. Migne II. 460, where also see the exposition of Bellarmine on this passage in note).

"Sed ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit — nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum representat." (Ibid. I. c. 14. ed. Migne II. 262.)

² In his answer to Gardiner, Cranmer says "I have cited Tertullian, who saith in many places that "Christ called bread his body." (ed. Parker Soc. p. 33. cf. also pp. 153—4 for the arguments on this point.)

³ "Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura panis est, accepit et gratias egit dicens, *Hoc est meum corpus*: et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi testamenti novam docuit oblationem; quam Ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in novo testamento." (Irenæus. *Contra Haeres.* IV. c. 17. ed: Bened. 249.)

⁴ "Spiritus enim neque ossa, neque carnes habet, sed de ea disposi-

Fol. 21a. WEDNESDAY. THE FOURTH DAY.

WIGORN.

Irenæus called it bread because it was bread before.

CANTOR.

QUESTIO. What is it that he calleth bread and wine?

CICESTRENSIS.

Allegeth *Hilarius*.

NORWICENSIS.

Rehearseth Austin with a weary process unworthy of remembrance and much against his own¹ purpose in the end.

CANTOR.

First it is called bread and after the consecration *significat Corpus Christi*.

LYCHEFELDIEN.

Fol. 21b. Before we go to the great mysteries we should have a solemn prayer and a solemn fasting.

CANTOR.

TERTULLIAN. *Docendo vocans panem Corpus suum, id est figuram Corporis.*²

WIGORN.

Granteth that Christ called bread his body.

tione quæ est secundum verum hominem... de pane, quod est corpus ejus, augetur." (S. Irenæus. *Contra Hæres.* lib. V. c. 2. ed. Bened. 294.

¹ awne in MS.

² See passage before quoted.

But meaning the name only that used before.

DUNELMENSIS.

AD TITUM. Paul bids us fly curious questions. Christ when he met with Mary Magdalen, she knew not his form because he was like a gardener, and yet was none indeed. So in the bread &c.¹

CANTOR.

Hoc est Corpus.

If that it were meant by *Corpus*, then were *Corpus* a figure of the body.

Fol. 22a. But the bread is the² figure. For the bread is the Sacrament.

LANDAFFENSIS.

If he said it were *figura non figurata* then the matters were out of doubt and question.

GENESIS 3. Example, *Memento homo quod cinis es et in terram reverteris.*

HARFORDIENSIS *contra* CANTOR.

OBJECTIO. This word *Hoc* should mean bread. And bread the body of Christ.

¹ This same example was used by Bishop Tunstall in his work on the Sacrament. "Et Mariæ Magdalenæ tanquam hortulanus apparuit, non prius agnitus quam eam nomine vocaret dicens, Maria: qua voce cognoscens illum, appellat eum Rabboni, Glorificata namque corpora similia angelis, hanc videntur habere dotem ut quando velint videantur, quando videri nolint mortalibus oculis conspicua non sint. Itaque qui arguit in Sacramento Corpus Christi non esse, quod oculis non videatur, resurrectionem Christi negare videtur." (Tunstall *De Veritate Corporis*. ed. 1554. fol. 27a.)

² "bodye" *erased* in MS.

If we should think the flesh of Christ's body is in the receiver, we should exclude Christ out of the Communion and the Sacrament.

OBJECTIO. The body of Christ is in heaven. *Ergo* he is not in the Sacrament. That the body of Christ cannot be under any form in the Sacrament.

It is but the grace that cometh unto us by the body (they say) we shall receive but a certain grace.

Fol. 22b. Then shall we change the name of the Sacrament of the body and call it the Sacrament of benefits which we receive by the body of Christ.

CANTOR.

REITERATIO. *Hoc est Corpus meum, id est figura Corporis.* Thus sayeth the old fathers.

HERFORD *contra* CANTOR.

Having respect to the hanging on the cross it is a figure.

It is nevertheless the very body that is in heaven.

Lanfrancus¹ understood it so who was your predecessor.

CANTOR.

You say the body is the figure of the body. Nothing is a figure but that which is seen visible.

HARFORD.

Fol. 23a. You confer the Sacrament of the Old

¹ In his *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini* written against Berengarius ed. Migne 407—442.

Testament with this, and make it of no more value in using (than) *Manna* and drinking water out of the stone; with, signifieth *Corpus figura Corporis*.

CARLIEL.

Said as the Bishop of Hereford, *id est significat Corpus figura Corporis*.

DUNELMENSIS.

Figuram non esse sine veritate Corporis.

You would deny that he had any body.

CANTOR.

That which is not can have no figure.

If he had no body, bread could be no figure of his body. This were to maintain *Manichaeus'* heresy.

CYCESTRENSIS.

Fol. 23b. Oil signifieth the Holy Ghost; yet the Holy Ghost did never die.

The flesh was left us a sacrament and Christ is there by a figure called *Typus*, which the schoolmen use when they demonstrate what¹ is meant here. *Caro, id est, Terra conversa in figuram suam*.

Figura here is the very thing itself.

CANTOR.

If oil represented the Holy Ghost then was there an Holy Ghost. So the figure of the body.

The figure of the horse, *id est*, the proportion of the horse. This is a figure

¹ "which" in MS.

called to shew; and there is no proportion in the Sacrament; for it were *absurdum*.

CYCESTRENSIS.

Granteth both the figure and the thing itself.

ROFFEN.

Fol. 24a. No man sayeth instead of *Hoc* put in *Panis*, but we say that *Hoc* meaneth *Panis*.

AUGUST. *Adhibuit Judam convivio suo in quo commendabat figuram Corporis sui.*¹

How the body is present and in what manner.¹

Quia divinitas infundit se elemento.

Therefore the human nature being in heaven may be said to be here, *non in unitate naturae sed in unitate personae*.

CYPRIAN,

Where the one nature is the other may be said to be.

There are four kinds of bread:

1. One natural; when he said *Non in solo pane vivit homo*.

MATT.

2. The second Sacramental, as *Panis quem frangimus*.

PAUL AD.
10. CORIN.

3. The third flesh; when he saith *Panis quem ego dabo caro mea est*.

JOHN 6.

Fol. 24b. 4. The fourth divine, as *Ego sum panis vivus qui de coelo descendi*.

LUKE 22.

When I was daily with you in the temple ye stretched out no hands against me, but this is even your very hour.

HARFORDE *contra* LINCOLN.

CHRYSOST.
SUPER JOHN.

That thing that thou seest, Christ would

¹ See passage quoted *ante* (fol. 4 b., note 4).

2 FISHES.

thee to believe that which thou seest not. Therefore he did those miracles. First that whensoever he said any word they might believe it.

If Christ would say "This is a woolpack," be it impossible that any could try it out, if he say it, though it were hay before, yet we must believe his word.

It is no carnal reason to say, that it is the body of Christ is beyond reason to believe.

Fol. 25a.

But that it signifieth Christ's body and bread also, every child may soon perceive.

LINCOLN *contra* HARFORD.

Two things are to be noted in Christ's miracles: the one was his doctrine; the other his works, which were to confirm and stablish his doctrine.

Beside the words the adversaries recite a miracle. But there is no miracle; but that which is seen they be but signs. Christ wrought no miracle but that which was seen.

CYCESTRENSIS.

REG.

Yes, forsooth; as *Pete tibi signum a Deo. Achab non petam. Ecce virgo concipiet* &c. Which is a miracle and not seen, for the people took Christ to be Joseph's son.

LINCOLN.

Yes; Mary knew it and felt the work of the Holy Ghost.

Fol. 25b.

ROFFENSIS.

I say not the bread is ¹ but a figure and

¹ "not" *erased* in MS.

that every man may perceive. But it is more than a figure for besides the natural bread there is an operation of divinity, for my senses when they taste and eat perceive but a figure.

CANTOR.

1. CORIN. 10. Saint Paul saith: *Panis quem frangimus est communicatio Corporis*. Even so Christ when he said: *This is my body* he meant *communione corporis*. For Christ when he bids us eat his body it is *figurative*; for we cannot eat his body indeed. When God commands a good thing to be done and forbids an evil thing it is no figure.

AUGUST. To eat his flesh and drink his blood is to be partaker of his passion, as water is water still that we are christened withal or that was wont to be put into the wine.

WIGORN. *contra* ROFFEN.

Fol. 26a. He presseth him that he thinks there is nothing more than he was before¹ but the grace of God as in all other Sacraments, and this is not more altered than other are. All writers yet speak of a change of the bread.

QUESTIO. What is it after the consecration more than it was before?

They call it also *Tremendum mysterium, horribile*.

ROFFENSIS.

In that bread is *communio Corporis Christi* in the good. But the ill do receive *mortem et judicium*.

¹ So MS. = after consecration, than there was before.

And that the doctors use these terms it is for the reverence, and so speak they of water.

Inspice vini divinam in a great Canon he proponeth¹. Also the question of Charles to Bertram: *Christus manducatur in Sacramento licet totus sit in coelo*.

It is transformed; for of the common bread before, it is made a divine influence.

Fol. 26b. The natural substance of bread remains as it was before.

CYCESTRENSIS.

That the authors were alleged wrong by my Lord of Rochester.

PROBATIO. *Bertram* is printed of late at *Geneva* among the Sacramentaries and corrupted.

For the bishop of Rochester, Fisher, brought the same author against *Æcolampadius* for the verity of the body of the Sacrament.

And sayeth also that Cyprian was wrong recited.

CYPRIAN. *Panis ipse omnipotentia verbi secundum naturam non in specie factus est caro &c.*² *Natura vel substantia non desunt*. Whether *natura* be substance or property.

ROFFENSIS.

Alleged *Cyprian* right for the words are here.

¹ So in MS.

² "Panis iste quem dominus discipulis porrigebat non effigie, sed natura mutatus omnipotentia verbi factus est caro, et sicut in persona Christi humanitas videbatur et latebat divinitas ita Sacramento visibili ineffabiliter divina se infudit essentia". *Sermo de coena Domini* in *Cypriani op.* ed. Basileae 1530. p. 445.)

Fol. 27a. It is changed in nature, that is to say in property.

CYCLIAN. *Vocat corpus panem propter membrorum convenientiam.*

Panis est propter nutrimentum corporis. Carnem vocat propter assumptae carnis proprietatem.

Proprietas assumptae carnis vita erat.

Divina essentia infudit se Sacramento.¹

CYCISTREN.

Like as in the humanity of Christ the Godhead was, even so the presence of his very body is in the Sacrament.

And my Lord also mis-rehearsed *Eusebius* upon this text: "Touch it with thy faith".

ROFFEN.

Fol. 27b. *Eusebius* saith that it is necessary to make a Sacrament of his body to the intent that his body might be honoured continually in a mystery in the Sacrament, which was offered for our redemption. And Christ's body in grace should be here present. *Fide estimanda non specie.²*

¹ "Panis est esca, sanguis vita, caro substantia corpus ecclesia: Corpus propter membrorum in unum convenientiam: Sanguis propter vivificationis efficientiam: caro propter assumptae humanitatis proprietatem, Hoc Sacramentum aliquando panem Christus appellat, portionem vitae aeternae, cujus secundum haec visibilia corporali communicavit naturae". (Ibid. pp. 444—5).

² "Et ideo quia corpus assumptum ablaturus erat ex oculis nostris et syderibus illaturus necessarium erat ut nobis in hac die sacramentum corporis et sanguinis sui consecraret: ut coleretur jugiter per mysterium quod semel offerebatur in pretium: ut qui a quotidiana et indefessa currebat pro hominum salute redemptio, perpetua esset etiam redemp-

EUSEBIUS, And for this word *in substantiam* I understand it thus *in proprietatem; in virtutem substantiae*.

*Nec dubitatur conversa in naturam Divini Corporis dicere, quando homo fit membrum Christi Corporis.*¹

CICISTRENSIS.

OBJECTIO. We receive the word in the Sacrament, not the substance of the body.

HILARIUS DE *Si verbum caro factum est &c.*

TRINITATE. *Et nos vere Verbum carnem cibo dominico accipimus*².

ROFFENSIS.

Fol. 28a. *Verbum carnem, id est Christum.*

CICISTREN.

HILARIUS. *Et naturam carnis sub Sacramento eternitate nobis communicandae admiscuit &c.*²

tionis oblatio et perennis illa victima viveret in memoria et semper presens in gratia. Vere unica et perfecta hostia, fide estimanda non specie". (Eusebius Emisenus. *Opera* ed. Paris. 1547. f. 44b.)

¹ "Nec dubitet quisquam primarias creaturas nutu potentiae, presentia majestatis in dominici corporis transire posse naturam, cum ipsum hominem videat artificio coelestis misericordiae Christi corpus effectum. Sicut autem quicumque qui ad fidem veniens ante verba baptismi adhuc in vinculo est veteris debiti, his vero commemoratis mox exiit omni tæce peccati; ita quando benedicendae verbis coelestibus creaturæ sacris altaribus imponuntur, antequam invocatione summi nominis consecrentur substantia illic est panis et vini: post verba autem Christi corpus et sanguinis est Christi. Quid mirum autem est si ea quae verbo creare potuit, possit creata convertere: imo jam minoris videtur esse miraculi, si id quod ex nihilo agnoscitur condidisse, jam conditum in melius valeat commutare". (Ibid. f. 47b.)

² "Si enim vere verbum caro factum est, et vere nos verbum carnem cibo dominico sumimus; quomodo non naturaliter manere in nobis existimandus est, qui et naturam carnis nostrae jam inseparabilem sibi homo natus assumpsit, et naturam carnis suæ ad naturam eternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit?" (S. Hilarius. *De Trinitate* lib. VIII. ed. Migne 11. 246.)

ROFFEN.

*Naturaliter Christus habitat in nobis.*¹
 Not only in unity and charity but real in his benefits.

CICISTREN.

If the body taken of the Virgin Mary be Christ.

WIGORN.

We are commanded to drink blood, which in the old law was forbidden. The doctors
 Fol. 28b. alleged must be understood as they speak plainly.

ROFFEN.

EUSEBIUS. *Invisibilis sacerdos convertit visibiles creaturas in substantiam naturae suae id est in substantiae proprietatem.*²

SMYTH.

ORIGENES. If it did sanctify of its own nature then it doth make holy the wicked man that doth receive the sacrament.³

¹ "Quisquis ergo naturaliter Patrem in Christo negabit, neget prius non naturaliter, vel se in Christo, vel Christum sibi inesse; quia in Christo Pater, et Christus in nobis, unum in his esse nos faciunt. Si vere igitur carnem corporis nostri Christus assumpsit et vere homo ille, qui ex Maria natus fuit, Christus est, nosque vere sub mysterio carnem corporis sui sumimus." (Ibid.)

² "Invisibilis Sacerdos visibiles creaturas in substantiam corporis et sanguinis sui, verbo suo secreta potestate convertit, ita dicens: Accipite et edite, Hoc est enim corpus meum." (Eusebius Emisenus. *Hom. V.* ed Paris. 1547. f. 44d.)

³ "Quemadmodum non cibus, sed conscientia cum hesitatione vescens polluit edentem, eo quod qui hæsitat, si vescatur, iudicatus est; et quemadmodum nihil est impurum per se polluto et incredulo sed propter ipsius immundiciem et incredulitatem: ita quod sanctificatur per

DURHAM.

Denieth that book to be of Origen's works.

ELIEN.

Erasmus saith it is Origen.

LONDON.

Scrutamini Scripturas. As we seek and hear, what shall we do then when we have searched? Believe then we must.

Fol. 29a. What shall we do then? Marry there abide, and go no further than our holy fathers that have searched and come to the belief (that) must be followed. They have found it; we should not then go seek it still, but follow them and believe as they did.

SMYTH.

ORIGEN.

*Si comederimus non abundamus, neque si non comederimus quicquam nobis deerit.*¹

LICHFELD.

Denieth his conversion, which was supposed to be by his words that he spake upon monday; and believeth that it is no

verbum Dei et per obsecrationem non suapte natura sanctificat utentem. Nam id si esset, sanctificaret etiam illum qui comedit indigne Domino." (Origen, *in Matth.* c. XV. ed. Erasmi. 1545. II. p. 28.)

Ridley in his "*Brief declaration of the Lord's Supper*" (Parker Soc. Works p. 29) says: "In the disputations which were in this matter in the parliament house and in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, they that defended transubstantiation, said that this part of Origen was but set forth of late by Erasmus and therefore is to be suspected."

¹ "Neque si comederimus abundabimus, neque si non comederimus minus habebimus", (Ibid).

gross body, but a natural body that is glorified and not only in virtue and spirit; but faith receiveth both the virtue and the natural body also.

CANTOR.

ORIGEN vel
CYRILLUS.

There is *Littera quae occidit* in the old and the new Testament.¹

Fol. 29b. In the new this is (*Littera occidit*), when Christ gave his body, to take it literally. The bread and wine are not changed outwardly but inwardly, as we are changed to be new men yet are we men still. Thou art made God's son, and Christ dwelleth in thy mind. The change is inward, not in the bread but in the receiver. To have Christ present really here, when I may receive him in faith, is not available to do me good.

Christ is in the world in his divinity, but not in his humanity.

The property of his Godhead is everywhere, but his manhood is in one place only.

VIGILIUS
CONTRA
EUTYCHEN.

These heretics denied that he was very man.

Fol. 30a. Two natures in Christ hath been ever received by the Church.

DUNELMENSIS.

CHRYSTOST. &
BASIL.

Authors say that Christ is here invisible; that doth appear by the *Canon* in their masses.

¹ "Consuetudo est Scripturae sanctae cum aliquid contrarium corpori huic crassiori et solidiori designare vult, spiritum nominare: sicut dicit: littera occidit, spiritus autem vivificat". (Origen, *Peri Archon.* lib. I. ed. 1545. I. 751).

*Ut visibilis Christi natura invisibilis sit in Sacramento.*¹

CANTOR.

But his body is not here invisible.

And there is in the beginning of Chrysostom's mass a prayer to himself which proves that it was not his mass.

But this is the mind of old ancient authors concerning *Hoc est Corpus*, whether Christ meant this to be his body or bread.

Fol. 30b.
CYPRIANUS
EPIPHA.

Such bread calleth Christ his body as is common among us, made with flour and water, and wine likewise. Such bread as feeds the body, that cannot hear nor see, but round, broad, thick and white.²

It is material bread that hath these qualities; his body was not so.

As the baker maketh it so doth the altar describe³ it.

These say Christ called such bread his body.

If you understand *Hoc*, this bread, then bread was his body. And if this word doth not⁴ signify bread, Christ said not that bread was his body.

¹ Quoted in Bishop Tunstall's *De Veritate Corporis* ff. 35 to 36a.

² "Videmus enim quod accepit Salvator in manus suas, veluti Evangelium habet quod surrexit in coena et accepit hæc, et ubi gratias egisset dixit, hoc meum est hoc et hoc. Et videmus quod non equale est neque simile non imagini in carne, non invisibili deitati, non lineamentis membrorum. Hoc enim est rotundæ formæ et insensibile quantum ad potentiam. Et voluit per gratiam dicere hoc meum est hoc et hoc: et nemo non fidem habet sermoni. Qui enim non credit esse ipsum verum, sicut dixit, is excidit a gratia et salute". (Epiphanius, *lib. Ancoratus* ed. 1542. p. 558.)

³ So in MS.

⁴ "not not" in MS.

WIGORN.

RESPON. They keep the name as it was before it was converted and Christ did it in a thought.

CANTOR.

Fol. 31a. Where calls Christ bread his body?
 "This glove is my cap"; who would believe it except he see it turned.

DUNELMENSIS.

The example of a cap is a mortal man's example. But Christ said it that might turn it in a moment.

CANTOR.

It was natural bread, but now no common bread for it is separated to another use. Because of the use it may be called bread of life.

That which you see is bread and wine
 But that which you believe is the body of Christ.¹

AUGUST. We must believe that there is bread and the body.

LINCOLN.

Fol. 31b. Two things were touched now.
 One, an answer to my Lord of Canterbury which is this: That it is called bread because it was called bread. As: the blind doth see. The disciples of John saw them that were blind see; therefore they believed

¹ "Quod ergo videtis, panis est et calix; quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renuntiant: quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi, calix sanguis Christi." (S. Aug. *Sermo* 272. ed. Migne. V. 1246.)

it because they knew them blind before. Likewise of bread: my senses see it is bread.

The other was, the omnipotency of God, that we should believe it there because that Christ did say it.

AUGUST.

But *Deus* is *sic omnipotens ut rationis institutum evellat*.¹

It should be seen and appear, if he had meant it so. For he is omnipotent and could have done it.

ROFFEN.

Fol. 32a.

It is carnal reason that letteth us. Carnal reason cannot believe that bread is his body. Therefore grossly he imagineth, that thinketh bread remaineth no more. A sacrament or mystery is not a *Do this in the remembrance of me*. It was instituted then a certain commemoration of his body.

The question is not whether he might do so or not; but whether he hath done it or not.

Baptismus nos salvat; not the baptism but the Holy Ghost which is offered unto us at our regeneration.

¹ So in MS.; read "*non* evellat,"

APPENDIX VI.

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

Several suggestions have been made by recent writers as to the sources from which THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION in the Communion service of the Book of Common Prayer were derived. The following table and remarks will further elucidate this question.

MOZARABIC.	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549.	BRANDENBURG-NUREMBERG 1533.
Dominus noster Jesus Christus in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem et gratias agens benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis dicens accipite et manducate. Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur. Quotiescumque manducaveritis: hoc	(Who) in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread and when he had blessed and given thanks ¹ he brake it and gave it to his disciples, saying: Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me.	Unser Herr Jesus Christus in der nacht do Er verraten wardt nam Er das brot dancket und brachs und gabs sein Jüngerem und sprach: Nembt hin und esset, Das ist mein leyb der für euch gegeben wirdt: das thut zu meinem gedächtnus.

¹ Tyndall's version of this passage of the Gospel is "and thanked"; Cranmer's version renders it "and when he had given thanks".

MOZARABIC.	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549.	BRANDENBURG- NÜREMBERG 1533.
facite in meam commemoratio- nem.		
Similiter et ca- licem post quam cœnavit dicens:	Likewise after supper he took the cup and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, say- ing: Drink ye all of this for	Desselben gley- chen namEr auch den kelch nach dem abentmal und dancket und gab ihn den und sprach: Trinckt alle daraus.
Hic est calix novi testamenti in meo sanguine qui pro vobis et pro multis effun- detur in remissi- onem peccato- rum. Quotiescum- que biberitis: hoc facite in meam commemoratio- nem.	this is my blood of the new Testa- ment which is shed for you and for many for remission of sins. Do this as oft as you shall drink it in remem- brance of me.	Das ist mein blut des neuen testamentes das für euch und für vil vergossen wirdt zur verge- bung der sünden. Solchs thut so oft irs trinckt zu mei- nem gedechtnus.

A few remarks may be appended on the early history of the Lutheran formula of Institution and on Cranmer's acquaintance with the Lutheran forms actually in use. As early as 1523 Luther, in his *latin mass*, had rejected the form of words generally adopted in the western church and framed another. Although he can hardly have consulted the Mozarabic Missal for the purpose, since this would have been just as distasteful to him in its continual expression of the idea of Sacri-

fice as the ordinary Missal, Luther's form contains a singular expression which is characteristic of the Mozarabic words of institution.¹

In his *german Mass* of 1526 Luther gave another form of institution² which has been the basis of the various formulæ used in the Lutheran churches, among the rest by Nuremberg in the order of 1533 as given above. The principle followed in the compilation of this form was, that it should be a harmony of all the four narratives of the Institution contained in the New Testament.³

The formulæ of Institution besides being contained in the Kirchen-Ordnungen, are also given in the various Lutheran Catechisms for children to learn by heart.⁴ Such a form accordingly appears in the Nuremberg Catechism, translated into latin by Justus Jonas and thence into english by Cranmer.

The Nuremberg formula given above naturally found a place in the german Catechism intended for that church,⁵ and was thereafter proposed by Cranmer as

¹ The Mozarabic has, "*hic est calix novi testamenti in meo sanguine*", (for which see Sabatier III. 699), Luther has "*Hic calix est novi testamenti in meo sanguine*" and this has passed into the danish formula compiled by Bugenhagen. Luther doubtless took his version from the Communion for Passion Sunday in the western Missals ("*hic calix novi testamenti est in meo sanguine, dicit Dominus*").

² See Daniel *Codex Lit.*: II 109. For variants see Kliefoth V. p. 109.

³ This principle is indicated in the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Order (1533) and in that of Cassel (1539. Richter I. 200 and 301) and more fully explained in the Frankfort order of 1530 (Ibid p. 141). So also in the Lutheran Catechism translated by Cranmer it is said, "Furthermore if any man will ask ye where this (*i. e.* the words of Institution) is written: ye shall answer: these be the words which the Holy Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke and the apostle Paul do write" (ed. Burton p. 213).

⁴ See e. g. Bugenhagen's *Kirchen-Ordnung* for Brunswick, 1528, (ed. Hänselmann pp. 253-5); and Luther's greater and lesser Catechisms, with their latin translations (in J. G. Walch's *Christliches Concordienbuch*).

⁵ See ed. Burton p. 175 and p. 181.

the formula of Institution to be taught to english children in 1548. "Wherefore good children" his translation says "ye shall duly learn the words by the which our Lord Jesus Christ did institute and order His supper, that ye may repeat them word for word and so print them in your memory that you may bear them away with you home to your fathers' houses and there often rehearse them."¹ The following is Justus Jonas' latin version of the german Nuremberg form with Cranmer's english translation of the latin.

LATIN OF JUSTUS JONAS.

"Dominus Jesus in ea nocte qua tradebatur accepit panem gratias agens, fregit, deditque discipulis suis et dixit, Accipite, edite; hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis datur, hoc facite in mei commemorationem."

Similiter accepit et calicem, postquam cenavit, gratias agens, dedit eis et dixit: Bibite ex hoc omnes, hic est sanguis meus novi Testamenti qui pro vobis et multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite quotiescumque bibitis in mei commemorationem."²)

CRANMER'S TRANSLATION.

Our Lord Jesus Christ the same night that He was betrayed, took bread and giving thanks brake it and gave it to his disciples and said: Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.

Likewise He took the cup after He had supped and giving thanks gave it to them and said: Drink of this all ye. This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of

¹ Ibid. 206.

² Ed. Burton p. 181.

sins. Do this as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me.”¹

It will be seen on examination of these formulae that apart from certain variations, which are merely of rendering and not of substance, the Nuremberg form of Institution, 1533, the latin of Justus Jonas, Cranmer's translation of this, and the form actually adopted in the first Prayer Book of 1549, are one and the same.²

The form of Institution in the Book of Common Prayer must consequently be referred for its origin to the Brandenburg-Nuremberg recension of the Lutheran recital and not to either the roman or the mozarabic.

¹ p. 195.

² As to the words “blessed and” see note on this passage of the Canon, chapter XII.

APPENDIX VII.

NOTE ON THE ACTS OF CONVOCATION 1547.

The acts of this Convocation have received very unfortunate treatment. Burnet (II. 2. Bk: 1. *Records* Nos. 16 and 17.) printed Cranmer's memoranda of certain petitions which the clergy of the lower house presented to the archbishop. These he gives on the authority of bishop Stillingfleet's MS. which is now at Lambeth (MS. 1108.). Strype (*Life of Cranmer* p. 220) gave a translation of what he considered to be the private notes of some member of the lower house. "Some account of what was done here I will in this place set down", he writes, "as I extracted it out of the notes of some member, as I conceive, then present at it". This extract he took from the *Synodalia* volume of the Parker MSS. at Cambridge (C. C. C. C. MS. 113, f. 5^a seqq.). Succeeding writers have regularly referred to Strype, although what he prints does not give any general idea of the document from which it is professedly drawn. Moreover it is so inaccurate in detail that it is worse than useless, and it seems indeed questionable whether Strype could ever have seen the original himself.

A partial copy of this document from the *Synodalia* volume, is to be found among White Kennett's collections (B. Museum, Lansd: MS. 1031, ff. 41^b seqq.).

This also is inaccurate and very imperfect; but even from this abridgment of the formalities and wording some idea of the real character of the original document may be gathered, which is sufficient to shew that Strype can hardly be correct in treating it as mere private and unofficial notes.

Another copy, probably made about the same date, is given in Egerton MS. 2350 (ff. 6 seqq.). The scribe was often unable to read the MS. before him, but many of the mistakes are corrected by a revising hand. Though still incomplete, the Egerton copy is in all respects to be preferred to White Kennett's. But as usual it is necessary to have recourse to the original MS. (C. C. C. MS. 113) in order to discover the real character of the document.

This paper comprises (1) the list of members composing the Convocation, which at first sight, by its omissions, corrections and additions, reveals itself as the original paper drawn up by the clerk; (2) a report in a fair hand, different from the preceding, of each of the eight meetings. This comprises a list of the members present at each meeting and a minute of business done. Strype's print is an imperfect and incorrect rendering of these minutes.

There seems no reason for doubting that these papers are a part of the journal of Convocation, and not as Strype supposed, mere "notes of some member... present at it". It is probable that they were abstracted by some influential person, like so much else, in the *sauve qui peut* which followed Edward's decease. Their abstraction accounts in part for the state of the Convocation records in this reign described by Fuller and Heylyn, who (not having seen the C. C. C. MS.) knew nothing of what took place in the Convocation of 1547. The original paper, mentioned p. 75 note (4), coming from the same source, is interesting as an illustration

of the method of "subscription" then in use mentioned in these official acts.

Wilkins' treatment of the Convocation of 1547 is as unsatisfactory as Strype's. He gives the "words" of the petition from the lower house "as they were found in archbishop Cranmer's MS. in the hands of Edward Stillingfleet, late bishop of Worcester", together with a few notes as to the sessions, with a reference to Cranmer's Register (which does not contain these acts at all).

A complete and accurate edition of these records is certainly to be desired. But on full consideration it did not appear that the document, with the long lists of names, had a sufficiently direct relation to the subject of this book to warrant its finding a place in the appendix.

The necessity for such a print of the original acts may, however, be illustrated by a passage from Burnet. "For the third petition" he writes of this Convocation, "it was resolved that many bishops and divines should be sent to Windsor to labour in the matter of a church service. But that required so much consideration that they could not enter on it during the session of parliament" (II. p. 53). There is nothing whatever to warrant such a statement, which is based merely on Burnet's sense of what might or should have been done.

INDEX.

Altars, destruction of, 256, 264, 266, 267, *note* 272, 284; word expunged from Prayer Book 290.

Antiphons, object of, 18, 19; absence of, in Quignon, 22.

Apostles' mass, 241, 246.

Arms, royal (in churches), 272.

Articles of religion, 304.

Ash-Wednesday, observance of, 98, 100.

Ashes 100, 252.

Baker, Sir John, 63, 66.

Bale, works of, 119.

Baptism, order for, *see* Prayer Book.

Barbero, Daniele, report of 271—276.

Barlow, bishop, 84, 85; sermons of, 48, 69; in debate concerning sacrament, 162.

Beauvais, cathedral of, 13.

Bells, ringing of, 55, 56, 272.

Benediction of Blessed Sacrament, 54 *note*

Bishops, authority of, derived from the king, 42, 43 *note*, 45, 66; attitude of, towards change, 71, 74 *note*, 83—88, 154, 256; whether unanimous, 71, 163, 167, 178, 233, 256; in debate concerning B. Sacrament 160—170; meeting of, for the revision of the Prayer Book, 178, 180, 285, 287 *note*; voting of, for Prayer Book, 171, 179.

Bonner, bishop, 45, 86, 239; injunctions given to 242; sermon of, at Paul's cross, 244; speeches of, concerning Prayer Book, 166, 170; imprisonment of, 57, 245; king's letter to, 152, 154.

Bread, blessed, 98, 195 *note*, 252.

Breviary, mediæval, 19, *see* Quignon.

Bucer, Martin, 127; his opinion of English reforms 250, 288, 292, 299—301; on bread and wine for communion, 295 *note*.
See Censura.

Bullinger, diary of, 119 *note*, 128; belief of, 231 *note*, 305.

Burnet, value of testimony of, 139, App. vii, 451.

Calendar, arrangement of, 32—35, 38 *note*, App. iv, 386—388.

Calvin, influence of, on english reforms, 93, 125, 305. *See* Helvetian school.

Cambridge, surrender of college at, 110; visitation of, 248.

Candlemas day, 98, 100.

Canon of Prayer Book 197. *See* Prayer Book; comparison of Roman, Sarum, York & Hereford, 198 *note*.

Canons, duties of, 6, 8; separation of regular and secular, 7; name of, 7 *note*.

Canterbury, instructions given to chapter of, 56.

Capon, bishop; 106.

Carlisle, cathedral of, 7.

Carthusians, customs of, 20 *note*, 92 *note*.

Cathedrals, services in, 5—9, 13, 55, 102.

Censura, the, 269, 270, 288 *note*, 292, 299.

Ceremonies, abolition of ancient, 53, 98, 104, 105, 109, 111, 147, 253, 271—272, 305; people's love for, 100.

- Chafyn, Mr. Thomas, 106
Chalice, mixed, 196 *note*.
Châlons, cathedral of, 13.
Chantry priests, 240.
Chuntries, 82 *note*.
Chapter, little, 18, 22.
Charles, emperor, reception of english ambassador, 51.
Chertsey, meeting at, 144.
Chrism, 228.
Churches, desecration of, 68, 255, 265.
Cinque ports, letter to warden of, 63.
Clement VII, 21.
Clergy, secularization of, 4; duties of, 5; attacks upon, 98, 126;
attitude of, towards change, 85, 86, 89, 135, 242, 250; *see*
bishops.
Clichtoveus, *Elucidatorium Ecclesiasticum* of, App. iii, 353.
Codex Liturgicus by H. A. Daniel. 184.
Collects, 32.
Commandments, reading of, in service, 291.
Commemorations, 53.
Commission, ritual, *see* Prayer Book.
Communion, Order of, 189; date of, 89, 189; first performance
of, 103; general description of, 90—93; authorship of, 94;
royal mandate concerning, 135; bills relating to, 70—74,
76, 121; contemporary opinion concerning, 79, 93; un-
der both kinds, 73, 77, 79, 84, 89, 91; confusion resulting
from, 135.
Concilia, Wilkins', 148.
Confession, Sacrament of, 102, 111, 257.
Confirmation, Order for, *see* Prayer Book.
Confiteor, 220 *note*.
Convocation of 1542, directions of, 4, 25, 149; of 1543, 53 *note*,
26; of 1547, 1, 148, 150 *note*; proceedings of, concerning
change, 73—77; of 1548, 149; prorogation of, 149, 285 *note*;
general regulations for, 77; Prayer Book never submitted to,

- 156, *see* Prayer Book; real connection of, with Prayer Book, 148, 181; records of Acts of, 150, 152, App. vii, 449; method of subscription to 74, 75, 76, 451.
- Cope, not necessarily sacerdotal, 189, 235; ultimate use of, 294.
- Corpus Christi, office of, 28; feast of, 39, 240, 247.
- Council Privy, of Edward's reign, 41—43, 100—102, 108, 114; disorders caused by, 67.
- Coverdale, opinion of 'Order of Communion', 93, 144; sermon of, 240.
- Cranmer, general views of, 40, 129—133, 176, 229, 233, 253; policy of, 253, 260; dealings of, with Convocation, 1, 75, 79; antipathy of, to Gardiner, 277; answer of, to Gardiner, 280; letter of, to Queen Mary, 156; library of, App. i, 313; book of, on communion service, 253; schemes of, for Prayer Book, 15, 23, 26—28, 30, 33, 36, 40, 79; influence of, in compiling Prayer Book, 180, 212, 233 *note*, 253, 256, 259; speeches of, concerning Prayer Book, 162, 169; drafted by, 17, 27, 34, App. i, 312; office done by, at St. Paul's, 241; character of 129, 230, 277; his catechism, 130, 131, 280.
- Daniel, H. A., *Codex Liturgicus* of, 184. &c.
- Darcy, Sir Thomas, 46.
- Day, bishop 167; imprisonment of, 268.
- "Devotions," 15.
- Dixon, Canon, theory of, concerning *Rationale* 26; evidence of, concerning sanction of Prayer Book, 148.
- Dryander, Francis, opinion of Prayer Book, 232, 239.
- Edward VI, accession of, 41; coronation of, 64; condition of religion under, 42, 81, 109, 121, 124, 271; ecclesiastical policy of reign of, 43, 48, 97, 109, 260; personal attitude of, towards religion, 121, 177; power of royal wish during reign of, 79; first Parliament of, 64, 98.
- Elizabeth, condition of religion under, 81.

English, use of, in services of the church, 30, 53, 84, 88, 102, 137, 237, 272. *see also* latin.

Erasmus, Paraphrase of, 121.

Evensong, *see* Matins.

Exhortations in Prayer Book, 192 *note*, 291.

Ferrar, bishop, 85, 172; consecration of, 144, 260.

Font, manner of blessing, 185.

Foxe, evidence of, 135, 137, 254.

France, churches of, 13.

Frankfort, troubles at, 305 *note*.

French ambassador, *see* Selve.

Fuller, Richard, statement of, on Convocation, 77; concerning Prayer Book, 138.

Gardiner, bishop, 44, 111; revenues of, 46, 274; letter of, concerning Barlow's sermon, 48, 51 *note*; sermons of, concerning chantries, 82 *note*, concerning ceremonies, 112; publications of, 119; attitude of, towards religious reforms, 61, 79, 116; opinion of, concerning Prayer Book, 113, 116, 284; imprisonment of, 57, 62, 113, 117; refusal of, to sign royal documents 278; trial of, 279—285; release of, 110; character of, 61, 277.

Gilby, Anthony, 122.

Gilpin Bernard, 271.

Glasier, Dr., sermon of, 49.

Glass windows, breaking of, 58.

Gloria in Excelsis, 221, 291.

Glyn, Dr., speech of, 248.

Goodrich, bishop, 27, 141, *note* 85

Goring, Sir William, 46.

Gradins, introduction of, 59 *note*.

Greek liturgies, 187 *note*, *see* Prayer Book.

Hales, sergeant-at-law, 170.

Hancock, Thomas, sermons of, 105.

Heath, bishop, 28 *note*; deposition of, 80; speeches of, 161, 168, 170; imprisonment of, 262.

Hebrew, use of, in public service, 236.

Helvetian school, influence of, 103, 119, 124—128, 133, 173, 230, 256 *note*.

Henry VIII, condition of religion under, 4, 40, 42, 252; death of, 40.

Hereford, rite of, 4, 198 *note*, *see* Prayer Book; letter of canon of, 10—12.

Hertford, earl of, 41.

Heylyn, evidence of, 100, 138; on Convocation, 286 *note*.

Holbeach, bishop, 144, 162, at Oxford, 250.

Hooker, Dr., 81.

Hooper, bishop, 120, 244; opinion of, on Prayer Book, 232, 236; injunctions of, concerning communion, 273 *note*; attitude of, towards change, 246, 256 *note*, 259; danger of, 270 *note*.

Hymns in office, 19 *note*; in Prayer Book, 32, 37, 246, App. iii, 353.

Images, condemnation of, 47, 50, 53, 101, 247, 255, 272; pulling down of, 58, 68.

Injunctions, royal, 53, 243.

Interim, the, 179, 220 *note*.

Introits of communion service, 190, 291.

Ireland, contemplated rising in, 51.

Jonas, Justus, 229.

Joyce, *Acts of the church*, 142, 148.

Jubilee, days of, 10.

Judges, influence of, 257.

Kyrie, 291.

Lamentacyon against the city of London, 123.

Lanfranc, evidence of, concerning the B. Sacrament, 167.

Lasco, à, 173, 230, 232 *note*.

Latimer, bishop, sermons of, 104; views of, 132 *note*, 244.

Latin, discontinuance of, 53, 58, 64, 88, 104, 246; popularity of, 237–239; use of, in Prayer Book, 23, 30, 236 *note*; *see also* English.

Laurence, Saint, day of, 13.

Law, power of, 79, 257.

Lent, observance of, 49, 50.

Lessons, *see* Prayer Book.

Lights in divine service, 59 *note*, 104, 235, 246, 264; prohibition of, 53.

Lincoln, use of, 37.

Litany, recitation of, 54.

Liturgy, *see* Mass *and* Prayer Book.

Luther, services of, 26, 36, 102, 217, 218 *notes*; liturgical reforms of, 219, 237; publications of, 119, 125; catechism of, 130, 280 *note*. App. vi, 446.

Lutheranism, rejected in England, 36, 176, 288; influence of, in England, 35, 124–128, 228.

Lynne, Walter, 121, 126.

Lyons, services in, 19 *note*.

Maden, Dr., 248.

Marcourt's *Declaration of the mass*, 119.

Martyr, Peter, 103, 235; tract of, on Sacrament, 158; letters from, 174, 250, 256.

Mary, princess, attitude of, towards change, 80, 153; religious ceremonies under, 10, 116.

Mass, offering of, 9, 11, 56, 270; recantations concerning, 50; regulations concerning, 69, 70, 91; questions concerning, 82–86; gradual abolition of, 102, 103, 128, 147, 196, 199 *note*, 242, 252; attacks upon, 64, 102, 120, 123, 126, 128, 276 *note*;

- doctrine of Real Presence in, 103, 121, 127, 131, 178, 205
note, 275 *note*, 280, 282, 295; *see also* Prayer Book.
- Matins, 253; provisions for, 31, 55, 56, 103; *see also* Prayer Book.
- May, Dean, 138, 297.
- Melanchton, Philip, 125.
- Memories*, 53 *note*, 269.
- Monasteries, effect of dissolution of, 5, 15, 255.
- Montesquieu, on ceremonies, 254.
- Morrice, Ralph, 17.
- Morwen, chaplain, 8.
- Mozley, T., on Catholic services, 238.
- Norwich, visitation of diocese of, 255.
- Oatlands, court held at, 145.
- Offertory, 193, 194 *note*, 270.
- Office, Divine, 126; recitation of, 5—7, 10—14 *note*, 38; general arrangement of, 17; burden of, 20; meaning of word, 16 *note*; substance of, 18; of the B. Virgin, 20; of the dead, 20; votive, 22 *note*; *see* Prayer Book.
- Ordinal, new, 259, 299; passing of, 261, 274.
- Ordinations held by Cranmer, 144, 260.
- Osmund, Saint, 7.
- Oxford, visitation of, 250—252.
- Paget, Secretary 41, 44; letter from, to Gardiner, 45.
- Palmer, Sir William, 16, 184 *note*.
- Palm Sunday, 98, 100.
- Parish churches, worship in, 5, 14.
- Parliament, first of Edward's reign, 60, 63, 64, 157; proceedings of, for Prayer Book, 72, 76, 160, 170—172, 181, 261; difficulty in tracing bills of, 70 *note*, 172 *note*.

Paul's Saint, sermons at, 49, 69, 110, 243; pulling down altars in, 240, 264; pulling down rood of, 68; innovations in, 240; desecration of, 265; ceremonies in, 269, 296.

Peregrinatio Silvæ, 6.

Perryn, retraction of, 50.

Petre, Sir William, 46, 80, 277.

Pictures, holy, 50.

Pilkington, answer of, to Morwen, 9.

Pinkie, thanksgiving for battle of, 65.

Pius V., reform of, 20.

Plague, visitation of, 134.

Plough, sermon of the, preached by Latimer, 104, 251 *note*.

Pole, Cardinal letter from, 51.

Ponet, Dr. J., Sermon of, 257

Poole, preaching at, 107.

Pope, omission of name of, 4 *note*, 27; supremacy of, 47.

Praise, sacrifice of, 209; *see* Prayer Book.

Prayer Book, veneration due to, 183; contents and account of MS. draft for, App. i, 311; name of, 54 *note*; object of liturgical formulæ, 184; first scheme for, 17, 23—27, App. ii, 315; second scheme for, 17, 30, 33, 35, 36, App. iii, 353; author of schemes, 17, 27, 34, App. i, 312; dates of, 17, 25, 27, 28, 39, 142; general arrangement of earlier book, 23, 30—35, 55, 56, 188—192, App. ii, 317; temporary nature of changes, 96, 234, 259, 304; present form of, 307; compilation of, 134—138; erroneous opinions concerning compilation of, 134—143; truth concerning compilation of, 143—147, 181; supposed commission for, 94, 136, 138, 140, 146 *note*, 178, 180; place of meeting, 136, 142, 143; date of commencing, 145; whether synodically approved of, 148, 151—153, 156, 178, 181; notes on Acts of Convocation, App. vii, 449; presented in the House of lords, 160; in the House of commons, 170; contemporary documents concerning, 137, 143, 152—153, 172, 235; contemporary opinion concerning, 172—177, 181, 232, 236, 271, 304; enforcing of, 242, 246, 251, 302; adherence

of the people to ancient ritual, 171, 246, 251 *note*, 252—258, 269, 303; royal injunctions concerning, 52, 54—57, 95; risings of the people against novelties in ritual, 51, 242, 247, 252, 254; connection of, with ancient service books, 3, 17, 23, 25, 30, 31, 34 *note*, 184, 188, 191 *note*, 217, 224, App. ii, 316; connection of, with Quignon's breviary, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 28, 33, 37, 187, 306, App. ii, 316, App. iii, 356; connection of with Lutheran liturgy, 35, 212, 217, 224, 228, 288; comparison of, with Lutheran liturgy, 220—224; preface of, 17, 36—38, 182, App. iii, 353; comparison of prefaces, App. iii, 356; lessons of, 24, 26, 30, 34, 35, 37, 274, App. iv, 383; hymns of, 32, 37, 246, App. iii, 353, 378—382; calendar, 32—35, 38 *note*, App. iv, 386; comparison of calendars, App. iv, 388; lights used in services of, 53, 59 *note*, 104, 235, 246, 264; rubrics of, 31, 39, 189, 191, 199, 234 *note*, 269, 283, 290; notes of, 189, 191 *note*; revision of, 285; general character of changes, 303. COMMUNION SERVICE of, position of, in Prayer Book, 188, 189; general arrangement of, 217; contemporary opinion concerning, 229, 246; documents concerning, 82, 95, 153; debates in parliament concerning, 160—172, 163 *note*, 181, 261. App. v, 395; report of, 397; connection of, with mozarabic liturgy, 185, App. vi, 344, 348; with greek liturgies, 186, 187 *note*; with Sarum use, 191 *note*, 199—212; with older liturgies, 184, 191 *note*, 217, 224; with liturgies of the 16th century, 217, 224, 228, App. vi, 445; vestments for, 189, 190, 235; vestments of Lutheran ritual, 220; whether idea of sacrifice is retained in, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 209, 219, 221, 247, 249, 281; introits of, 190, 191 *note*; of Lutheran ritual, 220; omission of *Confiteor*, 220 *note*; exhortation in, 192; offertory of, 193—195, 221, 270; *Gloria in excelsis*, 221; proper prefaces of, 196, 217; prayer of consecration 197, 217: comparison of, with canon of Sarum use, 199; *Agnus Dei* position of, 213; *Pater noster*, 212, 223; form of absolution, 214; form of institution, 206 *note*, 223; App. vi, 444; administration of, 195, 214, 220 *note*, 241, 272, 273; *see also* Order

of communion ; whether under both kinds, 223, *see also* Order of communion ; commemoration of the dead, 235 ; word oblation omitted, in 196, 217, 247 ; word altar retained in, 267. Communion service of second Prayer Book, 281, 288 ; commission for, 285 ; Gardiner's influence on, 277, 289 ; doctrinal changes in, 290 ; gratuitous changes in, 291 ; introits omitted, 291 ; idea of sacrifice obliterated in, 289 ; exhortation in, 291 ; *Gloria in excelsis*, 291, 294 ; alteration of *Sanctus*, 292 ; consecration prayer in, 289, 292 ; *Agnus Dei* position of, 294 ; form of institution. 282 ; administration of, 283, 290 ; arrangements for bread and wine for, 295 ; commemoration of the dead, 281, 289 ; rubrics of, 294, 297 ; position of minister, 296, 297 ; position of table, 296 ; vestments prohibited in, 294 *note* ; summing up of changes in, 289, 294, 303. Baptism, public, order for, 224, 272 ; comparison of, with Sarum use, 225 *note* ; private order for, 225 ; revised form of, 297. Confirmation, order for, 227 ; revised form of, 297 ; Burial, order for, 299 *note*. Ordinal new, 259, 299 ; passing of, 261, 274 ; *see also* Mass and Sacrament.

Preachers, *see* Sermons.

Preces, 20, 22, 31.

Press, control of, 118, 121 *note* ; general tendency of, 122 ; foreign works issued by, 125.

Priests, marriage of, 75, 273.

Primers, undue importance attached to, 4.

Processional, 54.

Processions, 65, 253 ; forbidden, 54, 100.

Psalter, distribution of, 23, 31, 272.

Purgatory, doctrine of, 104.

Quarant'ore, 54, *note*.

Quignon, account of, 20 ; breviary of, 21, 24, 37 ; *see* Prayer Book.

Rationale, 26, 29 *note*.

Redman, John, 76 *note*.

Reformed Liturgies, Character of, 217, 291, 301.

Reformers, destruction wrought by, 255.

Responsory, object of, 19; absence of, in Quignon, 22.

Revenues, ecclesiastical, appropriation of, 46.

Ridley, Nicholas, sermons of, 47, 64; attitude of, towards change, 85, 86, 141 *note*; coadjutor of Cranmer, 168, 247; views of concerning B. Sacrament, 170; speech of, at Cambridge, 248, 249; made bishop of London, 264.

Rogation days, 54 *note*.

Rome, services of, 19.

Roods, destruction of, 68, 69, 255.

Rouen, cathedral of, 13.

Rugg, bishop, 86; resignation of, 255.

Sacrament, Blessed, defence of, 73, 279, 282; bills relating to, 67, 69—73, 157; four views concerning, 126; debate concerning 160—172, 174; attacks upon, 69, 105, 122, 253; whether to be worshipped, 105, 123, 165, 178, 247; *see also* Mass.

Sacramentarians, 275,

Sacrifice, *see* Prayer Book.

Saints, omission of names of, 4 *note*, 33; commemoration of, 33, 37; attacks upon, 51, 123, 128.

Salisbury, Hancock's sermon at, 105.

Sarum, rite of, 4, 14 *note*; influence of, on Prayer Book, 17, 191, 194, 198 *note*, *see* Prayer Book; comparison of, with roman, 199; practice at, 20 *note*.

Schoolmasters, influence of, 257, 258 *note*.

Schulding, Cornelius, 306.

Scory, bishop, 10, complaint of, 13.

Scriptures, reading of, 18, 22, 24, 26, 30, 34, 35, 53, 56, 272; *see also* lessons in Prayer Book.

Seudamore, works of, 184 *note*.

Secret, the, 193.

- Sequences, omission of, 56.
- Selve, Odet de, reports from, 49, 50, 59, 72 *note*, 113, 143, 157.
- Sepulchre, the Easter, 111 *note*.
- Sermons, 39, 51 *note*, 55, 57; proclamations concerning, 108, 128, 221, 274; dictated by the government, 47; importance attached to, 57.
- Service books, ancient, destruction of, 270, *see* Prayer Book.
- Smith, Dr. recantation of, 50.
- Soames, evidence of, 141.
- Somerset, Duke of, 41; attitude of, towards religion, 50, 62, 113; letter of, to Gardiner, 129; letter from, to Cambridge, 147; speeches of, in parliament concerning Prayer Book, 161, 164, 166; dealings of, with preachers, 108.
- Sorbonne, influence of, 21.
- Southwell, Sir Richard, 46.
- Strype, life of Cranmer, 140; evidence of, 152.
- 'Supper of the Lord', *see* Mass.
- Supremacy, papal, 47, 257, 274; royal, 79, 114.
- Taylor, Dr., 73.
- Temporale*, the, 24.
- Thirlby, bishop, speeches of, concerning B. Sacrament, 162, 164; transferred to Norwich, 256, 263.
- Thomas, Saint, omission of name of, 4 *note*.
- Thomas', Saint, bell of, 10.
- Tonsure, 57.
- Traheron, Bartholomew, letters from, 132, 175.
- Tunstall, bishop, 43 *note*, 72, 79, 87; Cranmers friendship for, 29; in debate concerning the Sacrament, 161, 162; imprisonment of, 29, 302.
- Ulmis, John ab, letters from, to Bullinger 103, 133, 173, 231, 250.
- Uction, Extreme, administration of, 273.

- Uniformity, introduction of into service, 2, 36.
Uniformity, Act of, 3, 136, 148, 155, 177, 182, 191; provisions of, 236; second bill for, 302.
Unity, loss of, in matters of belief, 47, 81.
Universities, visitation of, 247—252.
Use, 19, 37; meaning of word, 14 *note*.

Vernacular, use of in prayers, 4; *see english and latin*.
Vespers, 31, *see also* Prayer Book *and* Matins, *and* Office.
Vestments, for communion service, 189, 220, 235, 294 *note*.
Virgin, Blessed, office of, 20; feasts of, 33, 243, 264 *note*; mass of, 56, 241; attacks upon, 123.
Visitation of 1582, 12. *see note*, of 1548, 52.

Water, holy, 47, 98, 252, 272.
Wentworth, lord, 46.
Windsor commission, the, 136, 144, 180; *see* Prayer Book.
Wingfield, Sir Anthony, 58, 80.
Worthiall, John, 76.
Whyte, Thomas, 107.

York, rite of, 4, 198 *note*.

1 1012 01021 8990

[illegible]

Printed in USA

